1972

The public information and public relations functioning of the Wisconsin Legislature's caucus staffs.

Kelly, Michael Stephen.

University of Wisconsin

http://hdl.handle.net/10945/16319

THE PUBLIC INFORMATION AND PUBLIC RELATIONS FUNCTIONING OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE'S CAUCUS STAFFS

BY

MICHAEL STEPHEN BELLE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

(Journalism)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals helped me in this study. I would like to single out several of those individuals deserving special recognition for their help.

This thesis depended upon the generosity and cooperation extended by the legislative Public Information Officers, the legislative leaders, and the legislative newsmen who agreed to be interviewed for this project. Those twenty-seven individuals gave unhesitatingly of their time during a rather hectic period of legislative activity. This author will remember those individuals by name, but they will remain anonymous to the readers of this thesis. The comments and insights of those twenty-seven anonymous individuals added a real world dimension to my journalism education.

I must also extend thanks to both Mr. Ed Crane of the National Legislative Conference and to Mr. Charles Davis of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders. Both gentlemen encouraged me in my research and shared with me their inside knowledge of the growing activity in legislative public relations.

Special thanks are in order for Dr. Alan Rosenthal of the Eagleton Institute of Politics. Dr. Rosenthal granted permission to cite from a not yet published manuscript of his which significantly affected the design of this research. In a similar vein, Professor Delmer Dunn of the University of Georgia receives my appreciation.

His Public Officials And The Press enkindled my interest in the government-press relationship on the state level. In addition, his comments regarding his study helped me conceptualize my own.

Professor Scott Cutlip, my advisor, stood by me while I struggled to design a meaningful thesis out of a nebulous area of interest. I am especially thankful to him for his critical expertise which forced me to extend myself. Professor Cutlip's enthusiasm for his work was "catching." He served as a good example when my enthusiasm lagged. My debt to him is lasting and great.

My greatest debt is to my wife, Mary, and to our daughter, Alison. Together they helped me persevere in my work. Their laughter made the workload lighter.

This past year and a half of study was made possible by the United States Marine Corps and its Special Education Program. Perhaps in the future my services will be as valuable to the Corps as my graduate education has been to me.

In conclusion, although all those individuals mentioned above aided me in this thesis, I alone am responsible for the final product that follows. Any and all deficiencies of the thesis are attributable to myself and to no other.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

THE STUDY

The Wisconsin Legislature is one of several state legislatures which are, in some manner, developing a public information or public relations function within the legislative branch of state government. These pioneering efforts in the implementation of a public relations function on behalf of the legislative branch of state government vary widely in design, nature, and organization. Yet, these individual efforts share a common goal of fostering more favorable attitudes towards the legislature, its members, and its work. By fostering such favorable public attitudes, the legislatures hope to bring about wider public understanding and greater public approval of legislative work. Moreover, incumbent legislators hope to benefit from such efforts in their re-election campaigns.

This study examines the growth of one such pioneering public information or public relations function within the four caucus staffs of the Wisconsin Legislature. These partisan staffs, a recent legislative innovation, have undertaken as an integral part of their work responsibilities numerous and varied communicative activities on behalf of individual legislators who are caucus members. Those activities, as noted by previous researchers, include speech writing, preparation and distribution of press releases, and advising on both

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The Study

The Commodity Institute is one of several state legislative units, but, to date, unlike, concerning a public information or public relations function within the legislative branch of state government. There potential activity in the dissemination of a public relations function on behalf of the legislative branch of state government was clearly in embryo, nothing, and non-existent. Yet, some institutional activity seems a reason good to consider such functional activities beyond the legislature, its members, and staffs. In contrast with Florida public activities, the legislature has a long tradition under public administration and greater public exposure of legislative work. However, increased legislative roles in research and efforts to shape resolution conditions.

This study examines the period in the mid-1970s when public information or public relations activities within the Ohio General Assembly of the commodity institute. These political activity, a period legislative leadership, and experience in the Ohio and in other work responsibilities assumed and varied communication activities on behalf of legislative leadership and the staff in general. These activities, as noted by previous researchers, include speech writing, preparation and distribution of press releases, and working on bill

constituent and media relations.[1] The caucus staffs now prepare and distribute radio tapes, and prepare and distribute photographs and slides in addition to their previously identified "public relations" activities.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this research is to describe more fully the activities of the caucus staffs serving the Wisconsin Legislature which can be broadly categorized as public information or public relations activities; and, to describe the effects those activities have upon the gathering and dissemination of legislative news in Wisconsin. By so doing, this research seeks to identify the need for such public relations activities on behalf of the members of the legislative branch of Wisconsin state government and to evaluate the impact of those activities upon the state's political communication process. It is through the state's political communication process that the citizens of the state learn of the governmental activity of their state. This study aims to achieve its purpose by meeting specific objectives:

Study objectives. 1. To determine the origin and growth of the public information/public relations activities of the Wisconsin Legislature's caucus staffs.

2. To determine the nature and scope of the public information/public relations activities performed by the caucus staffs.

3. To draw conclusions as to the attitudes of individual legislators, news reporters, and caucus staff Public Information Officers regarding the public information/public relations functioning of the caucus staffs.

4. To determine what amount of one week's Wisconsin press coverage of legislative news is in fact originated and disseminated through the publicity efforts of the caucus staffs.

5. To make more explicit the public information system of Wisconsin, that is, the system by which a citizen learns of the activity of his state government.

Public Information/Public Relations Defined

This researcher distinguishes two definitional levels for the terms "public relations" and "public information." The title of this thesis, "The Public Information and Public Relations Functioning of the Wisconsin Legislature's Caucus Staffs," refers to the more general level of definition where the terms "public information" and "public relations" are held, by this author, to be synonomous. This is so because, at this level, both terms refer to attempts by an organization to facilitate its relationships with its publics through a communication function. The basic difference between the terms on this level is that one term, "public information," normally refers to the facilitation efforts of government (the public sector) in its relationships with the publics it was instituted to serve, while the other term, "public relations," normally refers to the facilitation efforts of organizations in the private sector in their relationships

with their publics. Cutlip and Center define public relations as "the planned effort to influence opinion through socially responsible performance based on mutually satisfactory two-way communication."[2] That definition implies the adjustment or facilitation function which this author perceives in both the "public information" and "public relations" function.

The second level of definition used by this author refers to the differentiation of the activities undertaken so as to facilitate an organization's relationships with its public by type. Here the difference between the terms "public information" and "public relations" refers to the purposiveness and objectivity of the activity itself. The term "public information" when used to identify public sector (government) relationship facilitating communication efforts normally denotes neutral, factual, non-partisan communication disseminated objectively to the public. On the other hand, "public relations" when used to identify the private sector's relationship facilitating communication efforts normally denotes the purposive dissemination of less than neutral information.

This research will show that some state legislatures are indeed trying to establish true "public information" programs. But, Wisconsin's "public information" function is really more a "public relations" function since it consists primarily of the dispensing of purposive partisan information. This study will attempt to identify those activities of the caucus staffs which fit in the broad, generally acknowledged, categories of "public information" or "public relations" activities as others have defined them.

Justification

The growing reliance upon communication-oriented public relations activities by the members of the Wisconsin Legislature (and their partisan staffs) portrays a specific example of the continued growth of the public relations function within government. Furthermore, the Wisconsin Legislature's involvement with the often controversial public relations function is indicative of an emerging nationwide interest, on the part of state legislatures, in the public relations function as a political weapon. The legislative branch of state government, through such examples as Wisconsin, may be establishing a new milepost in the acceptance of the public relations function as a governmental policy tool. This may be so because the legislative branch of government, on all levels of the American governmental system, has traditionally opposed the growth of the public relations function, especially as utilized by the executive branch of government to generate public pressure for legislation.

Cutlip and Center argue that hostility to the public relations function within government stems from four conflicts of interest inherent in American democracy. One of these four conflicts is the "unrelenting struggle for balance of power between the legislative and executive branches of government."[3] That struggle occurs on all levels of the American governmental system.

Overt efforts are now being made by several state legislatures, including Wisconsin's, to move toward a semblance of equity with the executive branches of their state governments in the use of

public relations. Legislators have long observed that the public relations function is a power tool which the executive branch of government employs to its own advantage and often to the disadvantage of the legislative branch of government in the governing process. The legislative branch of government, on the state level, seems to be determined to regain power and prestige lost to the increasing dominance of the governmental process by the executive branch of government. To regain this lost power and prestige, the legislative branches of state governments are eyeing the public relations function as a way to assist legislatures in their competition for citizen attention with the other branches of government. This may indicate that the traditional hostility heretofore expressed by the legislative branch of government towards the public relations function is changing, if ever so slightly. Legislators still decry the public relations function as practiced by the executive branch of government, but, legislators appear to be using public relations techniques in their own behalf more than ever before. This ambivalance exhibited by legislators may be an indicator of underlying change in their view of the public relations function.

The public relations function continues to grow in significance as it increases in pervasiveness within the American society. The historical evolution of public relations intertwined that function with the communication function inherent in America's representative democracy. Critics have long debated the effects of the public relations function upon the workings of democratic government as

practiced within the United States of America. However, even though that debate continues to this day, the public relations function continues to mature, spread in scope, and enjoy increased acceptance by various institutions of society. This study probes for at least a partial answer to the important question of whether public relations has debased or improved the American governmental process. Specifically, this study probes for an answer to that question as it relates to the recent development of public relations activity within the legislative branch of Wisconsin's state government.

Even though this study restricts itself to the evolution of a legislative public relations function within the Wisconsin Legislature's caucus staffs, it should be representative in nature. The attitudes which the study seeks to uncover (see study objective 3) ought to be somewhat representative of the range of agreement and disagreement surrounding the public relations function as emerging in the state legislative bodies. That range will be defined by those persons most intimately connected with the budding legislative public relations function in Wisconsin, the legislators, their Public Information Officers, and the media reporters assigned to cover the state legislature. Therefore, if for no other reason, this research should be indicative of the attitude environment in which other such legislative public relations efforts will have to struggle for acceptance and maturity. This is especially so because the basic thrust of this exploratory investigation is an attitude survey of the three respondent groups towards the public relations function.

METHOD

The primary purpose of this research could best be achieved through a multi-dimensional research design. Moreover, since the research focused on a topic not previously investigated the research must be of an exploratory nature. Little documentation existed on the study's subject so oral sources were in most cases the only sources of information available. Because of its nature, and other factors, this research demanded the greatest flexibility possible in design and structure so that it could adequately handle any unanticipated developments which might have appeared during the study.

Basically, this study falls into one of four broad groupings of research as outlined in Research Methods In Social Relations by Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook.[4] These authors categorize that type of research as being research:

> . . . to gain familiarity with a phenomenon or to achieve new insights into it, often in order to formulate a more precise research problem or to develop hypotheses.[5]

This study was conceptualized as initial exploratory research, largely descriptive in nature, which would open up the topic area to more precise investigation in the future. Several distinct sources of data were employed in the conduct of this research.

Literature Search

An extensive literature search provided background information and helped the author formulate concepts of the research design. Many authors have dealt with the public relations function and its

relationship to the political communication process. However, no author has dealt precisely with the growth of a public relations function within the legislative branch of a state government and the impact of such an event upon newsgathering and dissemination of legislative news at that level. That is the gap in knowledge that this researcher hopes to fill.

Most of the material available pertaining to the growth of public relations within government deals with public relations as practiced by the executive branch of government on the federal level. James L. McCamy produced an insightful study of the nature and practice of federal administrative publicity during 1937 and 1938 against its role in modern governmental statesmanship.[6] J. A. R. Pimlott, an Englishman, examined the role of public relations in American democracy and pinpointed the struggle between the executive and legislative branches of government over the use of public relations as a power tool.[7]

Other studies have looked at the effect of the governmental function upon the newsgathering and reporting process. Most notable among these is Dan Nimmo's Newsgathering In Washington.[8] Douglass Cater studied the press's role in the modern day phenomenon of "government by publicity."[9] The American Institute for Political Communication examined The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship.[10] That study examined the "system" by which public affairs and political information news was transmitted to the public. That study's methodology included survey questionnaires and an extensive content

analysis of selected daily newspapers. The "system" concept as applied by that study to the political communication process adds a needed interaction dimension to the government-press relationship. William Rivers probed the reporter's relation to the government publicity efforts in his The Opinion Makers.[11] In a later work, Rivers categorized the nature of the government official-press relationship as an "adversary relationship."[12] The terms of that relationship explain how the two parties interact and why they interact that way.

Still other examinations have focused upon the governmental reporter himself. Leo Rosten's The Washington Correspondents is the benchmark for such studies.[13] This type of study has been duplicated for correspondents covering specific agencies and has even been done for state level governmental reporters.[14]

Researchers have examined the growth of public relations in state executive government.[15] They have also studied the interaction of state officials in all three branches of state government and the state press.[16] That study by Delmer Dunn of the interaction of Wisconsin state officials and the press serves as a base line upon which this researcher hopes to detect any change of the legislator-press relationship brought about by the development of staff assistance for legislators in the communication area.

A few political scientists have investigated the Wisconsin caucus staffs and commented upon their communication/public relations activities.[17] One of those researchers conducted a content analysis to see what success caucus staff produced press releases were having

in being published by the state press. He found that a substantial increase in press coverage of the legislature had occurred over time and attributed this increase to the efforts of the caucus staffs.[18]

Organizational Sources

As a result of the literature search the author contacted four organizations supporting legislative modernization efforts. These organizations were The National Legislative Conference, Lexington, Kentucky; The National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, Kansas City, Missouri; and, The Center for Legislative Service, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, Rutgers, New Jersey. This was done to determine what research, if any, had been done or was being done in the topic of legislative public relations efforts. The information gained, as will be shown later, convinced the author that interest in that topic area was growing but as of yet little had been done in terms of actual research in that area. The contacts also convinced the author that the area was one deserving research.

Historical Research

The author then reviewed documents held by the Wisconsin Legislature pertaining to the establishment and growth of the caucus staffs which subsequently undertook the performance of public relations activities for individual legislators. The paucity of such documents concerning the activities of the caucus staffs directly influenced the design of this project.

Focused Interviews

The primary source of material for this thesis is information garnered from individual legislators, capitol reporters, and caucus staff Public Information Officers through focused interviews. A total of twenty-seven focused interviews were held from mid-August through mid-October 1971. The purpose of these interviews was to compile information regarding the nature and scope of the caucus staffs' public relations activities while simultaneously ascertaining the attitudes of the three groups toward those public relations activities. The interviews were of the "purposive" type.[19] Questions on various topics relating to the public relations activity were asked. Not all questions were asked all respondents. Questions were not asked all respondents in the same order. This technique is sometimes referred to as an "experience survey" or as "focused interviewing." The technique requires "that the interview allow the respondent to raise issues and questions the investigator has not previously considered."[20] Moreover, this research technique allows the respondents to present "their" definition of the preanalyzed situation.[21]

Focused interviewing is an often used tool of researchers investigating aspects of the political arena. Two legislative scholars, Malcolm Jewell and Samuel Patterson, commented that "focused interviewing is surely the most common kind of legislator interviewing although its methods and techniques have varied greatly."[22]

John Wahlke used this technique in his often cited The Legislative System.[23] Donald R. Matthews relied heavily on this

technique for his study of U.S. Senators and Their World.[24] Matthews devoted a chapter of his work to the Senator-press relationship. Delmer Dunn used "focused interviewing" as the primary data collection tool for his study of "Interaction Between The Press and Wisconsin State Officials."[25] Dunn subsequently published his study in book form as Public Officials and the Press.[26]

Selection of respondents. Eight legislators considered to be legislative leaders (either majority or minority leaders in both houses and each caucus chairman) were selected as respondents. This selection of legislative leaders parallels the selection of legislators for the Dunn study.[27] Legislative leaders were chosen because of their leadership position and hence their involvement with directing the caucus staff support provided their fellow caucus members. Moreover, these legislative leaders were anticipated to act as spokesmen for their legislative body in relation to legislative conflict with the executive branch of state government.

All the caucus staff Public Information Officers (N = 4) were designated as respondents. They were selected because of their positions as the key persons in the ongoing public relations activity. These four persons were to be the expert witnesses as to the nature and scope of the public relations activities performed by themselves and their staffs.

A representative sample of sixteen media reporters (from both the print and electronic media) who cover the legislature on a regular basis was chosen through a consensus of the press corps regulars

Pennsylvania Law and Order or Gov. Shapiro and Their Agency.[75] Written
Service is adequate if one mail is the medium chosen availability.
Letters from Governor Lawrence Shapiro to the primary site activities
used for the study as Commissioner Shapiro has first and foremost
State officials.[76] Some commonly published in study in book
form as Public Opinion and the Press.[80]

Subject to requirements. Other legislative conditions to
be legislators leaders failure requires or simply freedom to call
reason and non-events of their own authority or responsibility. Had
selections of legislative records provides for authority of legislative
for the Bond Act.[77] Legislative Journal were minor causes of that
leadership position had been their involvement with discussing the
course with support provided to a action course measure. However,
these legislative leaders were authorized to act as sponsor for
their legislative body to initiate it. Establish the conflicts with the
executive branch of state government.

All the actions with Public Information Officers (P.I.O.s)
designated as responsible. They were directly because of their
positions as the key persons in the regular public relations activity.
These four persons were to be the source of information as to the
and scope of the public relations activities performed by Commissioner
and their staffs.

A representative sample of actions which requires time and
the print and electronic media. We cover the legislators on a regular
basis are chosen through a procedure of the press corps reviews

themselves (see Table 1.1). The reporters by the nature of their adversary role view public relations activity suspiciously. Therefore their opinions were sought as a devil's advocate regarding this growing public relations activity. Besides, their position as chief gatherers and disseminators of legislative news placed them in a position where they could evaluate any change in the newsgathering and dissemination process brought about by the public relations activity.

The minority leader in the Assembly could not be interviewed because of his heavy workload and demanding schedule. However, since this research is exploratory and not definitively precise his absence should not materially affect the findings. The three other leaders from that party should provide an adequate representation of that party's points of view.

Recording the interviews. All but three of the twenty-seven interviews were tape-recorded through the consent of the respondents based on the author's promise of anonymity for the respondents. While there is a possibility that tape-recording interviews might inhibit a free exchange between the respondent and the interviewer, there are positive factors involved in recording interviews. Recording an interview facilitates a conversational type atmosphere as opposed to the somewhat stilted atmosphere that accompanies interviewing which relies upon written note taking. Recording interviews also assists in categorizing and transcribing respondent statements correctly.

Table 1.1

Affiliations of Newsman Interviewed

Reporter's affiliation	Number of reporters interviewed
Associated Press	1
United Press International	2
Milwaukee Journal	2
Milwaukee Sentinel	2
Wisconsin State Journal	1
The Capital Times	2
Appleton Post-Crescent Green Bay Press Gazette	2
WIBU Radio	1
WIBA Radio	1
WISC Television	1
WMTV Television	1
WKOW Television	1
Total	16

The author took notes during the interviews to distract attention from the recorder and provide a newspaper-type interview situation which responsents might find more comfortable. These notes allowed follow-up questions as the interview progressed and also assisted in locating items on the tapes.

The three interviews held without recording were due to noisy locations not conducive to recording. Locations of the interviews varied as did their time lengths. Most interviews were held in capitol offices. A few were held in restaurants, private residences, and some took place in a place of employment different from a capitol office. Interviews varied in length from thirty minutes to two hours and thirty minutes. The average interview lasted slightly over one hour in length.

All respondents seemed frank and honest in their responses. Reporters, more so than the other two groups, seemed concerned about whether their answers agreed with what other reporters were saying.

Classifying a Week's News

Another distinct source of data for this study came from a content analysis of Wisconsin newspapers. The author had a professional clipping service provide (at cost to the author) clippings of all news items, in all Wisconsin papers, both daily and weekly, for the week of October 3, 1971 through October 9, 1971, mentioning individual legislators and/or legislative activity. These items were then categorized by type and the number of items per category were counted. The purpose of this phase of the project was to determine

what amount of that week's legislative news originated as press releases by individual legislators or were originated in their behalf by caucus staff personnel.

Observation

The final source of data for this study was direct observation of legislative activity by the author. This observation took place during the two month long interviewing phase of the study. Moreover, this direct observation was supplemented by daily reading of both Madison and Milwaukee papers. This reading assisted the author in knowing reporters through their work and also assisted the author in keeping up with legislative activity. Regular radio listening and television viewing were also performed to keep in touch with the electronic media's news coverage of the legislature, but, this was not undertaken as systematically as was the newspaper reading. Besides, as the author became more familiar with capitol reporters during the course of the study, many informal conversations took place with them. These conversations were especially insightful into the day-to-day legislative newsgathering process and legislative politics.

SUMMARY

The multi-dimensional research design outlined in this introduction presented itself as the best way to study the growth and impact of the legislative public relations activity in Wisconsin. The lack of other previous research and documentation of these activities

precluded more precise research designs.

This study attempts to isolate and describe the growth of legislative public relations within the Wisconsin Legislature and to ascertain the attitudes of the participants in Wisconsin's political communication process towards those activities. Wisconsin's example represents another important step in the maturation and acceptance of the public relations function within government. A traditional foe of the public relations function within government, the legislative branch of government, is itself, on the state level, apparently moving towards utilization and appreciation of that function.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 1

[1]See Alan Rosenthal, "An Analysis of Institutional Effects: Staffing Legislative Parties In Wisconsin," Journal of Politics, Volume 32 (August, 1970), 541; and, Warren Rockwood Wade, "The Adequacy of Legislative Staffing In The Wisconsin Legislature" (a research paper submitted in lieu of a thesis for the Master's degree, University of Wisconsin, 1968), p. 11.

[2]Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations, Fourth Edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 2.

[3]Ibid., p. 536.

[4]Claire Sellitz and others, Research Methods In Social Relations, Revised Edition (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959).

[5]Ibid., p. 50.

[6]James L. McCamy, Government Publicity (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939).

[7]J. A. H. Pimlott, Public Relations And American Democracy (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951).

[8]Dan D. Nimmo, Newsgathering In Washington (New York: Atherton, 1964).

[9]Douglass Cater, The Fourth Branch Of Government (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959).

[10]American Institute For Political Communication, The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship (Washington, D.C.: American Institute For Political Communication, 1966).

[11]William Rivers, The Opinion Makers (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965).

[12]William Rivers, The Adversaries (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970).

[13]Leo C. Rosten, The Washington Correspondents (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937).

[14]See Douglas Luther Strole, "Newsgathering At the Pentagon" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1971); and, Arthur Garcia, "A Study of the Opinions and Attitudes of California's Capital Correspondents," Journalism Quarterly, 44, No. 3 (Summer, 1967), 330-333.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 2

[1] See also Hawkins, "An Analysis of Conditions Affecting Marketing Institutions," Journal of Marketing, 12(1), July, 1947, pp. 1-8; Hawkins, "Trends of Change in Marketing Institutions," Journal of Marketing, 13(1), July, 1948, pp. 1-8. See also Hawkins, "The Role of Institutions Serving in the Distribution Process," in Theory and Practice in Marketing, Proceedings of a Conference on the Theory in Marketing, University of Pittsburgh, 1948, p. 12.

[2] David A. Zwick and Elmer L. Lewis, Marketing Principles, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, p. 2.

[3] Ibid., p. 10.

[4] Ralph Sullivan and Alfred, Jr., Marketing Principles in Action, Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, 1951.

[5] Ibid., p. 10.

[6] Jones, L. Brooks, Principles of Marketing, University of Oklahoma Press, 1951.

[7] A. R. Elliott, Jr., Public Relations and Business Management (Prentice, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951).

[8] Max S. Wiley, Marketing in Institutions (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951).

[9] Benjamin Gates, The Public Relations of Business, Chicago: Business Bulletin, 1951.

[10] Marvin Bellows, The Public Relations of Business, The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1951, pp. 1-4; Bellows, Marketing for Public Relations, 1951.

[11] William Evans, The Public Relations Counselor, Public Press, 1951.

[12] William Evans, The Advertising (Boston: Boston Press, 1951).

[13] Max S. Hayes, The Marketing Consultant (New York: Ronald, Brown and Company, 1951).

[14] Ben Seligman Lewis Brown, "Developments in the Theoretical Implications Under Leader's Theory, Bulletin of Economics, 1951; and, Arthur Gaston, "A Study of the Business and Economic of Collegiate's Capital Correspondents." Marketing Institutes 14, no. 1 (January, 1951), 119-122.

[15]Fred E. Merwin, "Public Relations and the State Government," Journalism Quarterly, 14, No. 4 (December, 1937), 342-352; and Gerald J. Keir, "Government Public Relations and the Press in Michigan," Journalism Quarterly, 43, No. 3 (Autumn, 1966), 551-552.

[16]Delmer Delano Dunn, "Interaction Between The Press and Wisconsin State Officials" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967).

[17]See Rosenthal and Wade.

[18]Alan Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin" (manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Robison) September, 1969).

[19]Sellitz, Research Methods In Social Relations, p. 57.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., p. 265.

[22]Malcolm E. Jewell and Samuel C. Patterson, The Legislative Process In The United States (New York: Random House, 1966), p. 522.

[23]John C. Wahlke and others, The Legislative System Explorations In Legislative Behavior (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 33.

[24]Donald R. Matthews, U.S. Senators and Their World (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960).

[25]Dunn, "Interaction Between The Press and Wisconsin State Officials."

[26]Delmer Delano Dunn, Public Officials And The Press (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969).

[27]Dunn, "Interaction Between The Press and Wisconsin State Officials," pp. 26-27.

Chapter 2

BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

The growth of Wisconsin's legislative public relations activities parallels the establishment and growth of the caucus staffs serving the Wisconsin Legislature. This is so because the public relations activities have surfaced from within the caucus staffs. Wisconsin's legislative public relations activities apparently arose from a need on the part of individual legislators to communicate with their constituents and the availability of partisan staff personnel capable of providing assistance to legislators so as to allow them to meet that need.

The caucus staffs are themselves recent legislative innovations in Wisconsin. They date from the early 1960's. The creation of these partisan caucus staffs marked another effort by the Wisconsin Legislature to improve itself and its legislative activity. The Wisconsin Legislature presently finds itself, as do those in other states, caught up in a nationwide drive urging the reform of state legislatures. This legislative modernization drive has its own history.

Legislators and other persons concerned about the role that state legislatures were playing in the American governmental system banded together into special interest groups. These groups sought

to rectify the imbalances apparent, to them at least, in mid-twentieth century American government. They were concerned over the growing dominance of the governmental process by the national level of government and by the executive branch of government on all levels. This dominance had affected the roles of the other branches and levels of American government. Moreover, that dominance, as the special interest groups saw it, rendered ineffectual the system of constitutional checks and balances upon which the American governmental system was conceived.

The special interest groups set out to return the state legislatures to their proper roles, as they saw it, in the governmental process. The groups took it upon themselves to return the state legislature to its rightful place, as they conceived it, in the governing process by modernizing and professionalizing the business of lawmaking on the state level. Specific areas were singled out for attention in these attempts to improve the legislatures. One legislative observer described those areas of attention.

> The reformers propose that the legislature should be more professional, Legislators should be better paid and should serve longer terms, and they should have better staff assistance, professional advice, and facilities for working. The legislatures should meet more often for longer sessions, and it should be better organized to permit both more efficiency and more careful deliberation.[1]

The legislative reformers wanted to bring the legislatures up-to-date in their lawmaking procedures and thereby return the legislature to its rightful place in the governing structure. They wanted to impart an efficiency, a professional capability, and an

to notify the individual employee, in time to insure, in sufficient safety, further punishment. Employees suspected over the possible existence of the punishment provided by the individual level of punishment and up the executive ranks of increment in its intensity. This enhances and achieves the purpose of the entire disciplinary system, rather than punishment. However, this technique, as the superior informed groups and it, increased inefficiency the employee of supervisor should not increase this action the increase punishment under the procedure.

The special disciplinary system has its to prevent the minor infractions to their proper notice, in time and it. In the punishment process. The proper tool of good discipline is taking the above infractions to its superior group, so that supervisor in the providing process by monitoring and professionalizing the business of disciplining on the minor level. Specific steps must adopted and for elimination in those strategies to improve the disciplining. The individuals observer disciplined those areas of weakness.

> The reformers proposed that the legislature should be more professional. Legislators should be better paid and should serve longer terms, and they should have better staff assistance, professional advice, and facilities for working. The legislature should meet more often for longer sessions, and it should be better organized to permit more more deliberation and more careful deliberation.[1]

The legislative reformers worked to bring the legislature up-to-date to state lawmaking procedures and thereby return the legislature to the original place in the governing structure. The method to improve an efficiency, a performance capability, and to

air of importance to the state lawmaking function which had been conspicuously absent from that function for too long a time.

This chapter will present a broad outline of the legislative modernization drive which has provided the impetus for needed legislative reform and in so doing has facilitated such legislative innovations as Wisconsin's caucus staffs. This outline should help explain why legislatures are paying increasing attention to public information/public relations efforts as possible tools to be used in their own behalf. Furthermore, this chapter will detail the growth of the Wisconsin Legislature's caucus staffs, thereby setting the stage for an analysis of the public relations activity of the Wisconsin Legislature and for an assessment of the impact of those activities upon the state's political communication process.

THE MODERNIZATION DRIVE

The Movement Generally

State legislative reformers claim that the state legislatures are truly the peoples' branch of government. They see the state legislatures as middlemen in the American governmental system and the branch which makes most of the laws affecting the daily lives of state citizens. The reformers also claim that the state legislatures best represent the plurality of America's citizens. But, they also fear that the legislative branch of state government has been an almost "invisible" branch of government since the mid-nineteenth century.

A popularly held image of incompetency, inadequate resources,

and outdated practices have hindered the functioning of state legislatures since the mid-nineteenth century. Popular discontent with state legislatures, according to William J. Keefe, dates from uneasiness concerning legislative activity in the 1850's. That uneasiness, which was based on rampant corruption in legislatures, brought about a wave of constitutional revisions to limit legislative powers.[2] Restrictive actions of this type gave more power to the governor and the executive branch of state government and upset the balance of the state governmental system.

State legislatures became even more powerless as time moved on and America surged into the twentieth century. The malapportionment of legislatures gave rural areas more voting power in the legislature than the rapidly expanding urban areas even though America was becoming an increasingly urban country. The dramatic growth of the federal government during the New Deal era and World War II further imbalanced the dynamics of the American governmental process and in so doing affected the state governing process. These and other factors left the state legislatures in precarious and powerless positions. Malcolm Jewell, a legislative scholar, summarized the plight of state legislatures in this way:

> State legislatures have failed to meet the challenge of change because they have been handicapped by restrictive powers, inadequate tools and facilities, inefficient organization and procedures, unattractive features that produce excessive turnover in legislative service and lack of public understanding and confidence because legislatures themselves have been duly timid in using powers already in their possession to strengthen their role.[3]

Yet, while legislatures remained generally idle and unchanging, their governmental roles were increasing significantly. Alexander Heard pointed that out in his State Legislatures In American Politics.

> The increased significance of government generally in American life means that the state legislatures are part of an increasingly pervasive system of political decision making. At the same time, the center of gravity in this system has shifted steadily to the federal level.[4]

Heard also claimed that state legislatures may be our most extreme example of institutional lag. He categorized them as being largely nineteenth century organizations in their formal qualities while they must, or should, address themselves to twentieth century problems.[5] Heard's description implied the aims of the legislative modernization drive. Belle Zeller stated the problems facing state legislatures more succinctly in his American State Legislatures.

> Present day legislative responsibilities are of such complexity, such magnitude, that they cannot be met adequately by the old-fashioned, time consuming legislative procedures, antiquated organization, inadequate and incompetent staff services.[6]

Legislative leaders and concerned citizen groups began to recognize the plight of the outdated, ineffectual, powerless legislature. They embarked upon a drive to update and professionalize state legislatures. Their aim was to regain for the legislature its proper role in the American governmental system. The backers of this drive sought increased independence and public support for the state legislatures. These reform efforts have come to depend, to a great extent, upon the winning of public approval and public backing for specific reform efforts. In order to gain increased independence and

public support, the legislative branch of state government must draw citizens' attention back to the state legislature. So leaders of the modernization drive emphasize that a public information/public relations function should be integrated with all specific efforts to effect legislative change. Through such a function, the reformers hope to be able to enlist public support for their programs which are designed to make state legislatures dynamic governmental institutions once again.

The Growing Public Relations Emphasis

David H. Beetle, writing in the November 7, 1966 issue of the Nation, compared the special interest groups dedicated to getting the legislatures to adapt and survive to the citizenry which moved to save the whooping crane from extinction.[7] The nationwide communication networks provided by these special interest groups allow for the free exchange of ideas, techniques, and procedures which can serve to strengthen legislatures. One such idea moving through those communication networks provided by the legislative special interest groups concerns the public information/public relations function and how that function can help state legislative bodies.

Among the many organizations formed to take up the cause of revitalizing state legislative government, the Council of State Governments, headquartered in Lexington, Kentucky, is the oldest. The Council was established in Chicago in 1947.[8] Its reason for being is "to service the Governor's Conference (the executive branch), the Legislative Conference (the legislative branch), and the judiciary."[9]

Another interest group, the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, originated from a meeting of legislators held by the New York Legislature in Albany, New York in 1959. It is a bipartisan organization "dedicated to strengthening the states and the state legislative process through enlightened leadership."[10]

In 1960, the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders joined with the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University in Rutgers, New Jersey to establish a Center for Legislative Service. That center had a three-fold purpose:

> First, it is prepared upon invitation, to enter any state and produce a detailed, practical and realistic study of the legislature, including comparative information on technique, rules, staff, composition, etc. Each study contains solid recommendations for added efficiency in the legislature. Second, the Center is compiling information from the 50 states on such matters as organization, research and staff, facilities, size, frequency of session, etc., with the eventual goal of dissemination of such information. Third, the Center is available to answer the questions of any legislative leader on matters of a substantive nature or in relation to the above subjects.[11]

A third major group supporting legislative reform is the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures. The Citizens Conference began in 1965 as an integral part of the wider national movement seeking to improve the effectiveness of state government.[12] Its most recent, and probably its best publicized project to date is its Report on an Evaluation of the 50 State Legislatures.[13] This report evaluated state legislative capabilities in five areas--functional, accountable, independent, informed, and representative. This report rated each of the fifty state legislatures one against the others across these five areas of legislative capabilities. This measurement

presented graphically where each legislature stood in relation to the other forty-nine legislatures as measured in terms of those five areas. The comparison, as the Conference pointed out, is relative; so, all fifty legislatures, no matter what their ranking, still have room for improvement. The report, first released in February of 1971, was subsequently released in book form as The Sometime Governments.[14]

These groups urging the improvement of the state legislative process by modernization of the legislature straightforwardly acknowledge a need on their part to communicate their goals to the general public. Mr. Larry Margolis, the Executive Director of the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, stated in the 1968 Yearbook of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders that:

> When we talk about revitalizing state legislatures we mean to create a visibility for the legislature through which the citizenry can see what the legislature is doing and can react to what it is doing.[15]

Margolis implied that a two-way communication process between legislature and constituents is one goal of legislative revitalization. He reiterated his "visibility" theme in an article in the 1969 Yearbook.

> When we face the question of whether or not to make a proposed change or when we try to decide what constitutes an improvement, we should rate it against this scale. If it provides more visibility for the legislature (which in turn can produce other changes), if it promotes self-competency and thereby provides the capacity to be independent, then the change is worth making.[16]

These groups have given attention to the communication function in their short existences. A proposal for improving the nature of the legislative "image" was included in the report of the Third National

Conference of State Legislative Leaders in 1961. This proposal specified the communications mission of the legislature; the nature of the legislative "image"; what the public does not know about the legislature and what should be told; the proposal identified legislative attackers; and, it also enumerated the basics of a permanent communications program. The proposal was a research report compiled by the staff of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders and each delegate to the annual meeting received a copy.[17]

The Council of State Governments published a pamphlet, Mr. President ... Mr. Speaker, in 1963. This pamphlet was a report by the Committee on Organization of Legislative Services of the National Legislative Conference. The report specifically mentioned the need of a public information function for state legislatures.

> This committee cannot recommend specific methods of solving the problem of improved public information for the legislature, but it does point to the matter as a problem and suggests that legislators, especially the legislative leadership, in each state could well devote attention to it.[18]

The pamphlet further pointed out a key disadvantage of the legislature in its public information competition with the executive branch of government as being the nature of itself as a multiple member body.

> But, the legislature, its branches, and its responsible agencies, (standing and interior committees, research councils, and others) engage in far-reaching concerns, and the public interest profits from adequate, balanced publicity regarding them.[19]

The legislative special interest groups have carried forward their communication message and are now trying to assess their efforts

in that area. The National Legislative Conference currently has underway a survey of the public information/public relations programs of the fifty state legislatures. This project originated in a panel discussion on the subject at the National Legislative Conference's Annual Meeting in August of 1970.[20] That panel received information on programs as undertaken by several states.

Maryland had retained a private public relations firm to handle its public information program. That program includes brochures; radio and television spots; weekly reports on the status of legislation, hearing schedules and other pertinent information; and an Information Desk Service.[21]

The Texas Senate had undertaken certain steps to provide the public with more information on its activities. This program is handled in house under the control of the Senate Secretary. Those steps included brochures; a full-time photographer who handles pictures for Senate members; a radio tape release program for senators; and television facilities for video tapings by members.[22]

The North Dakota Legislature had hired a full-time staff associate to implement a public information program. The staff associate publishes a newsletter; writes articles for private publications; works with the wire services; prepares information documents; assists the television media; supplies factual information on laws and programs passed by the legislature; and assists staff members in preparing reports.[23]

A preliminary analysis of eleven completed survey questionnaires

of the ongoing survey by Mr. Edward Crane, the Secretary of the National Legislative Conference, suggested the following:

(1) the variety of activities thought to be included in the category of "public information" is considerable; yet few states have a comprehensive conception or definition of that area; innovative approaches are promising but sporadic;

(2) few Legislatures have focused on "public information" as an over-all concern;

(3) mechanisms for providing information to various segments of the public range widely from one state to another; while some employ one or more staff agencies for this purpose, no special arrangement exists in most legislatures; diffusion or fragmentation are common features of legislative public information efforts;

(4) progress in development of public information/mechanisms has been erratic, but there is a growing awareness that much needs to be done;

(5) over-all "goals" of public information activities, relating to the function and image of the legislatures, are generally absent; there is relatively little provision for coordination to achieve these goals; likewise, little effort is made to identify the effects of public information activities or to evaluate them;

(6) few legislatures have or are seeking to create plans for future development or modification of public information activity;

(7) written descriptions of current public information programs, reports dealing with proposed future developments, and legislation or rules which affect availability of information to the public, are not readily available;

(8) finally, most respondents were interested in obtaining information on what other legislatures are doing or planning in this area.[24]

The intent of the National Legislative Conference was to examine the completed survey and then decide whether or not to establish a special committee on public information for state legislatures.[25] Mr. Crane's tentative conclusion was that a considerable contribution could be made by the National Legislative Conference in forming a committee on public information. This committee could then offer assistance to any state desiring to initiate or improve upon an already operative public information/public relations program.

The recently published The Sometime Governments by the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures urged legislatures to make themselves "open" and "accessible" to the various news media, both print and electronic.[26] The legislative evaluation study, upon which the book was based, gave emphasis to providing whatever physical facilities the news media required in doing their job. The report tacitly implied that coverage of the legislature may improve if the legislature makes the first move by providing "access" and the physical facilities that journalists need to ply their trade. Furthermore, the Citizens Conference urged legislatures to "do everything they can to invite and attract more and better coverage by the press and the electronic media."[27] The press is valued because of its ability to generate public awareness and understanding of the legislature. The Sometime Governments stated that every legislature "should also have an information or press officer to serve the press and the public."[28] The book also cited Rhode Island as the first state to create a "press office" and said that many states are looking at that office as a possible example for emulation.[29]

It appears that the emphasis placed upon the establishment of a public information/public relations function on behalf of state legislatures is continuing to grow. The communication network created by the legislative reform groups has contributed to the spreading idea of formalizing the legislative public relations function. But, that network may not be the only factor bringing about legislative interest in the public relations function.

The congressional example. Another factor influencing the growing interest in a legislative public relations function may be the example of congressional members who utilize innovative communication and public relations techniques to communicate with their constituents. Congress provides itself with radio and television recording studios which members can use at minimal cost to themselves. Moreover, individual congressional staffs often employ a press aide, a public relations aide, or a press secretary whose primary work involves the handling of the communication needs of an individual legislator. The congressional orientation handbook for incoming congressmen underscores this staff trend.

> Whereas some members prefer to handle their own press relations, working directly with district editors and publishers whom they know personally, a substantial number of Congressmen delegate this responsibility to a staff employee who has had newspaper or related media experience. The 1969 CONGRESSIONAL STAFF DIRECTORY lists only seventy-seven individuals with the title of press assistant, press secretary, or public relations aide, but this figure is misleading; in many offices, the administrative assistant is a former newsman, and a major portion of his time is devoted to work with reporters and editors in the district and elsewhere.[30]

State legislators, in some cases, may have observed the congressional example, evaluated it positively, and then emulated that example in their specific situation. At least one legislator interviewed in this project specifically cited the congressional example as one reason behind the growth of Wisconsin's legislative public relations activities.

Public relations in campaigning. Another factor that might be contributing to the growth of a legislative public relations

function may be the increasing importance of public relations techniques in political campaigning. Legislators, having employed sophisticated communication techniques in their own election campaigns, carry both their reliance upon those communication techniques and their knowledge of those techniques with them into office. And, while the legislator, or elected official, remains in office, he uses similar techniques so as to improve his chances for re-election.[31]

Public relations growth generally. Furthermore, the growth of legislative public relations mirrors the growth of the public relations function generally within America's complex, interdependent society. More and more persons seek access to the available communication channels so as to communicate their desired messages. But, the communication channels are restricted in their amounts of available space or time and many persons find the cost of access to the channels prohibitive. This situation breeds sophisticated competition for access and for the attention of the public. Public relations serves to provide an edge in that competition.

Other factors not mentioned may also be affecting the growth of interest in a legislative public relations function. Nevertheless, the fact is that an interest has emerged and continues to spread. The factors previously mentioned have been active, to some degree, in the specific case of Wisconsin's legislative public relations activities.

WISCONSIN'S CAUCUS STAFFS

The Wisconsin Legislature has established itself as an innovative legislature both through its legislation and by its professionalization efforts. Wisconsin was the first state to legislate a modern, enforceable income tax.[32] In 1901 Wisconsin was also the first state to establish a Legislative Reference Library, now known as the Legislative Reference Bureau.[33] This bureau is responsible for collecting, summarizing and indexing information of a legislative nature relating to legislation of foreign countries, other states, municipalities, and the federal government.[34] The Legislative Reference Bureau assists Wisconsin's lawmakers in their legislative efforts by providing information upon their request. In 1947, the Wisconsin Legislature equipped itself with a legislative council and a legal staff.[35] The council was designed to study various problems of government and report the results to the legislature. By early 1960, the Wisconsin Legislature had equipped itself with staff assistance in bill drafting, in legislative research, and in statute revision.[36]

Dr. Alan Rosenthal of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, a student of the Wisconsin Legislature, claims that a major impetus for further legislative modernization efforts during the 1960's was a sharp alteration in Wisconsin's state politics.

> Wisconsin had traditionally been dominated by Republicans. They controlled every legislature from 1939 to 1959 and held the governorship during those two decades as well. Not until the period after 1945 did the contemporary Democratic party begin its development, and not until 1958 did it elect a governor and

simultaneously gain control of the state Assembly. Since then, partisan politics in the state have been highly competitive.[37]

Rosenthal argues that the change in the partisan environment of Wisconsin politics "especially the confrontation between a Democratic governor and a Republican legislature from 1961, through 1964, prompted the drive for a stronger legislature."[38] That drive for a stronger legislature brought into being the caucus staffs which currently perform numerous public relations activities on behalf of individual state legislators.

The Ford Study

During 1959 the legislature began negotiations with the Ford Foundation for a grant to partially finance a study which would implement legislative reorganization and improve legislative procedures. In October of 1959, the Ford Foundation approved a six year grant of $240,000 to aid in financing a project to strengthen the operations of the legislature.[39] The project focused on three legislative areas. Phase I concerned itself with fiscal review procedures and budget analysis. Phase II looked at legislative organization and procedure. Phase III concerned itself with improving legislative staff services through three demonstration projects. The three projects were a legislative intern program, fiscal analysts, and research analysts for the party caucuses.[40] The demonstration projects were undertaken to assess the value of such staffing to the legislature and its committees.

The legislative committee on Legislative Organization and Procedure, which supervised the study, started the demonstration

projects in December of 1964. Four full-time research analysts were employed, one assigned to each party caucus in each house of the legislature, and four part-time legislative interns were employed, two for each house.[41] Each party caucus chose its own research analysts and the analysts received their assignments directly from the caucus. Initially, the analysts analyzed bills on their respective house calendars. The caucus analysts were made full-time permanent positions in October of 1965.[42] However, in 1967 the caucus analysts were transferred directly to the legislature itself, and, from then on, the analysts were paid directly from the legislature's budget. This transfer was made through Senate Bill 206, which became Chapter 21, Laws of 1967. This action gave the caucuses even more control over their own staffing.[43]

The caucus staffing project was controversial from the start. Some legislative leaders believed that existing legislative research staffs were sufficient to provide any information an individual legislator might need. A few leaders feared the potential adversary relationships of analysts working for different parties. Besides, many worried over the use of state funds to support political parties within the legislature. There was both, according to Rosenthal, public and press antagonism towards this move.[44] But, caucus staffing quickly became accepted and the central caucus staffs became a legislative fact of life.

Caucus Staff Expansion

The different caucuses utilized the flexibility provided by

problems in Commerce or Agriculture. Some full-time research analysts were employed, but analysts in each party worked in small groups of the legislature, and their primary concern was with explaining the law to their bosses.[11] Each party worked closely in the research activities and the analysts remained under partisanship strongly from the states. Initially, the analysts concentrated their attention on their respective home districts. The course assigned were some full-time personnel positions in October of 1965.[12] However, in fact the young analysts were considered directly to the legislative staff, and, thus, from the end the analysts were paid directly from the legislature's budget. This structure was some-what dental but not, which lessen slightly at, been at last. This service was somewhat more long related and their own analysts.[13]

The young analysts project was unsuccessful from the start. Most legislative leaders believed that assisting legislative personnel might have difficulties in providing any information or assistance legislative staff need. I the leaders during the provided knowledge technologies or analysts working for different purposes. However, many worried over the use of these funds to support specialist positions outside the legislature. Their was both, according to Dawson, public and press supporting systems this some.[14] Not, young analysts quality review committee members and the members should which bring a high-level of the life.

Course Staff Expansion

The different research utilized the flexibility provided by

the 1967 switch which gave each caucus control over its staffing. The caucuses generally expanded their staffs and defined their roles in the process. As they did so, the caucus staffs moved from performing strictly bill analyses to other tasks, including public relations.

The Assembly caucus staffs grew from one to three research analysts in 1967 while the Senate staffs retained their single analyst per caucus. During May of 1968, the Assembly caucus staffs designated one member of each of their staffs' as a Public Information Officer for that caucus. This was done, according to a previous researcher's study, to qualify that individual for a higher pay scale.[45] Caucus staff personnel are unclassified legislative employees, that is, non-civil service employees, and are paid on a scale similar to that of the civil service personnel. In early summer of 1968, the two Senate caucus staffs also designated one member per caucus as a Public Information Officer.[46]

The title of Public Information Officer as originally bestowed upon the "directing" or "head" caucus analyst within each of the caucus staffs was misleading. Their chief responsibility was still research and analysis and not the communication function normally associated with the title of Public Information Officer. But, as the caucus staffs further evolved, the title of Public Information Officer began to fit the individual so designated somewhat more accurately than at first. Almost as soon as they were formed, the caucus staffs embarked on public relations activities on behalf of individual legislators. Dr. Rosenthal noted that:

> Caucus staffs were not originally intended to engage in public relations activity, but this rapidly became one of their most important functions. From the very beginning, the general need for PR assistance existed and legislators had only to be encouraged by analysts in order to request specific help.[47]

In the 1967 session, caucus analysts estimated that one-half of their time was spent during that session working in the public relations area.[48] Caucus staff personnel wrote press releases, speeches, newsletters and also distributed photographs.[49] Legislators, apparently, had come upon assistance in an area that they considered important but had neglected previously because of unidentified reasons.

Since 1967 the staffing pattern for the legislature, which includes the caucus staffs, has been established by a resolution of the legislature submitted during the session.[50] This arrangement provided the two legislative parties with more flexibility in staffing their own caucuses. The size of the caucus staffs have varied. The majority and minority party makeup of the legislature has been one of the influences upon the size of the different caucus staffs. Lately, caucus staffing has taken on a "competitive" or "keep up" nature of sorts and an increase by one may quickly be followed by increases in the other staffs.

Recent newspaper articles have estimated that the total salary cost of the staff assistance given legislators in 1971 was $302,300.[51] This figure includes the four central caucus staffs' personnel, a total of eighteen personnel, and twenty-two administrative assistants to individual legislators.[52] One newspaper article identified the

two types of staff and their duties.

> Party staffs have been in existence several years. Staff members study bills, do legislative research, help develop party strategy and handle public relations.
>
> The administrative assistants are a new breed. They are assigned to individual senators who can demonstrate that their workload requires extra help. Their specific assignments depend on the wishes of their employers, and may include answering mail, studying bills, writing speeches and handling the problems of constituents.[53]

University of Wisconsin Professor James R. Donoghue has cited the growth in the size of the "legislative bureaucracy" in Wisconsin from 1948 on. He singled out the greatest increase within that bureaucracy in that group that immediately serves the two houses of the legislature themselves.

> This includes not only more clerks, messengers, secretaries and the like but perhaps more significantly, though not necessarily in numbers alone, is the emergence of staff aides directly associated with the leadership. Among these are policy researchers and assistants serving the leaders and the two party caucuses. In earlier times legislators got such assistance from personnel detached temporarily from departments, or from academics from the University or from lobbying organizations. In many cases the legislator did his own staff work as best he could.[54]

Wisconsin's legislative bureaucracy is growing; and, the legislature's emphasis upon improving its staffing services has been significantly responsible for this growth. The growth of specialized staffs like the caucus staffs have opened up for action areas previously left untouched for one reason or another. This specialization and the provision of staff has facilitated the growth of public relations activity within the Wisconsin Legislature. Some leaders initially feared the duplication of effort that might have come about because of the establishment of the caucus staffs. They thought that

the caucus staffs would duplicate the efforts of other already functioning research staffs. Instead, it appears that the availability of the other research staffs have allowed the caucus staffs to undertake other duties for legislators, including public relations activities.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 2

[1]Malcolm E. Jewell, "The Changing Face of State Legislatures," in The State and the Metropolis, by Daniel R. Grant, Lee S. Greene, and Malcolm E. Jewell (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1968), p. 64.

[2]William J. Keefe, "The Functions and Powers of the State Legislatures," in State Legislatures in American Politics, ed. by Alexander Heard (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 52.

[3]Jewell, "The Changing Face of State Legislatures," p. 63.

[4]Alexander Heard, ed., State Legislatures in American Politics (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 3.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Belle Zeller, ed., American State Legislatures (New York: Thomasy-Crowell Company, 1954), p. 3.

[7]David H. Beetle, "Legislatures: The 100-Year Lag," Nation, November 7, 1966, p. 475.

[8]National Legislative Conference, Summary of Proceedings Twenty-Third Annual Meeting, (Atlanta: The Council of State Governments, 1970), p. 5.

[9]Ibid.

[10]The National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Brochure (Milwaukee: National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, undated).

[11]Ibid.

[12]The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, "On Behalf of State Legislatures," Brochure (Kansas City, Missouri: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, undated), p. 2.

[13]The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, Report on an Evaluation of the 50 State Legislatures (Kansas City, Missouri: The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, 1971).

[14]John Burns, The Sometime Governments (New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1971).

[illegible]

[1]Gellhorn [illegible], "The Changing Face of State Legislatures," p. [illegible].

[2]Alexander Heard, ed., [illegible] (Chapel Hill: [illegible], [illegible]), p. [illegible].

[3]Ibid.

[4]Walter Nelson, ed., [illegible] (New York: [illegible], [illegible]), p. [illegible].

[5]David S. Saxon, "Legislatures: The 1970s and Beyond," [illegible] (Summer 1971), p. [illegible].

[6]National Legislative Conference, [illegible] (Washington: [illegible], [illegible]), p. [illegible].

[7]Ibid.

[8]The National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, [illegible] (Lexington: [illegible], [illegible]).

[9]Ibid.

[10]The Eighteen Conferences on State Legislatures, "A Study of State Legislatures," [illegible] (Denver: [illegible], [illegible]).

[11]The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, [illegible] (New York: [illegible], [illegible]).

[12]Jack Stone, [illegible] (New York: [illegible], Inc., [illegible]).

[15]Larry Margolis, "Revitalizing State Legislatures," Yearbook of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Number 3 (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Office of the Secretariat, National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1968), p. 12.

[16]Larry Margolis, "Some Considerations For Legislative Modernization," Yearbook of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Number 4 (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Office of the Secretariat, National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1969), p. 9.

[17]National Legislative Conference, Report of Third National Conference of State Legislative Leaders (Nevada: National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1961), pp. 45-48.

[18]National Legislative Conference, Mr. President ... Mr. Speaker, Report of the Committee on Organization of Legislative Services of the National Legislative Conference (Chicago: The Council of State Governments, 1963), p. 71.

[19]Ibid., p. 70.

[20]Letter from Mr. Ed Crane, Secretary of the National Legislative Conference, to the author, May 6, 1971.

[21]National Legislative Conference, Summary of Proceedings Twenty-Third Annual Meeting, p. 40.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid., p. 41.

[24]Memorandum to the Members of the Executive Committee National Legislative Conference from Mr. Ed Crane, Secretary National Legislative Conference, April 16, 1971.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Burns, The Sometime Governments, pp. 94-96.

[27]Ibid., pp. 95-96.

[28]Ibid., p. 96.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Donald G. Tacheron and Morris K. Udall, The Job of the Congressman, Second Edition (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1970), p. 111.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[31]For an understanding of public relations growing importance in political campaigning see Stanley Kelley Jr.'s, Professional Public Relations And Political Power (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956); and, Dan Nimmo's, The Political Persuaders (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

[32]Alan Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin" (manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Robison, 1969), p. 5.

[33]The Legislative Reference Bureau, The Legislative Reference Bureau Can Help You, Informational Bulletin 70-6 (Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Reference Bureau, 1970), p. 9.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," p. 7.

[36]Ibid., p. 8.

[37]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[38]Ibid., p. 7.

[39]Committee on Legislative Organization and Procedure, The Wisconsin Study Third Report (Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Council, 1965), p. 17.

[40]Ibid., pp. 17-33.

[41]Ibid., p. 29.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Legislative Programs Study Committee, The Wisconsin Study Fourth Report (Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Council, 1969), p. 23.

[44]Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," pp. 16-17.

[45]Warren Rockwood Wade, "The Adequacy of Legislative Staffing In The Wisconsin Legislature" (a research paper submitted in lieu of a thesis for the Master's degree, University of Wisconsin, 1968), p. 11.

[46]Wisconsin Senate Payroll, 1968.

[47]Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," p. 27.

[illegible]

[48]Wade, "The Adequacy of Legislative Staffing In the Wisconsin Legislature," p. 12.

[49]Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," p. 28.

[50]See Chapter 81, Wisconsin Session Laws, 1967.

[51]See The Milwaukee Journal, July 7, 1971; and The Capital Times [Madison], July 8, 1971, p. 1, cols. 1-4.

[52]The Capital Times [Madison], July 8, 1971, p. 1, cols. 1-4.

[53]The Milwaukee Journal, July 7, 1971.

[54]James R. Donoghue, "Chapter Four of: The Basis of Government," (unpublished mss., University of Wisconsin Extension, The Institute of Governmental Affairs).

[illegible]

Chapter 3

THE CAUCUS STAFFS' PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS VIEW WISCONSIN'S LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC RELATIONS FUNCTION

Wisconsin's four legislative Public Information Officers, one per party caucus in each of the legislature's two houses, are the principals most directly involved with the legislature's public relations activities. The information officers not only perform many of the public relations endeavors themselves but also supervise other caucus staff personnel in similar activities. Basically, the Public Information Officers are communication technicians. All but one have had mass media work experience. The fourth information officer has gained a working knowledge of the mass media through his on-the-job experience. These four men assist the individual legislators from their respective caucuses in communicating with audiences that the legislator specifies. From their positions, the four Public Information Officers have had a direct opportunity to exert influence upon the gathering and dissemination of legislative news in Wisconsin.

This chapter will relate the opinions and attitudes of the Public Information Officers concerning their public relations activities. The material for this and the subsequent two chapters is drawn from focused interviews with the subjects of each chapter. Generally, this chapter will cover what public relations activities

Chapter 1

THE CHURCH BODIES' PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICES
VIEW LEGISLATOR'S LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC
RELATIONS PROCESS

Conversely from legislator Public Information officers, and the party stands in need of the legislator's has issues, are the principals more currently involved with the legislator's public relations activities. The information officers are only partners and of the public relations activities connected with their superiors since those which personnel in similar activities. Relatively, the Public Information officers are commissioners technicians. All but one have had some audit help experience. The Church Information officer has gained a working knowledge of the area media through his work-job experience. These four are around the informal legislative from their respective churches in communicating with authorities and the legislator specifics. From their positions, the four Public Information officers have had a direct opportunity to work influence upon the marketing and dissemination of legislative news in churches.

This chapter will review the opinions and attitudes of the Public Information officers concerning their public relations activities. The material for this and the subsequent two chapters is drawn from focused interviews with the majority of each sample. Generally, this chapter will cover what public relations activities

the caucus staff Public Information Officers perform; the purpose which the public relations activities are supposed to serve; and, the impact of the activities upon the traditional flow of legislative news.

A description of the information officer's role, as seen by the information officers themselves, is essential to the creation of an overall description and understanding of the interaction of legislators, their information personnel, and the media representatives with whom they deal. To date, the Public Information Officer positions in each of the four caucuses have been largely self-defining in nature. That means that the individual Public Information Officer has greatly shaped the dimensions of his own position. It is significant that each caucus operates independently of the others, including its politically related caucus in the other house. Each caucus staff is an organization unto itself which may or may not be similar to one or more of the other caucus staffs.

The four party caucuses in the Wisconsin Legislature vary in size. This past session had as its largest caucus the Assembly Democratic caucus with sixty-five legislator members. The smallest caucus, the Senate Democratic caucus had thirteen members. These variations in size affect the activities which can be undertaken by the information officers and the amount of time that they can devote to various projects. Moreover, the caucus leadership, the elected legislators guiding their fellow party members, dictate, to a large extent, what direction the supporting caucus staff personnel,

including the Public Information Officer, will take during the session. So, each caucus staff maintains an autonomous position in regards to the other staffs.

In the two Assembly caucus staffs, the Public Information Officers also serve in the position of caucus staff directors. The Assembly Public Information Officers, from their dual positions, also direct the research efforts of the other caucus staff personnel. The situation is somewhat different in the Senate caucus staffs. There, both caucus staffs have a designated Caucus Staff Director. The Public Information Officers in the Senate caucus staffs operate predominantly in the public relations area under the guidance of the Caucus Director.

Even though there are marked dissimilarities among the four caucus staffs they all share concern and interest in communicating the views and activities of the legislator caucus members to the public. This concern brings them to commonly share different communication techniques which they utilize in their communication efforts.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITIES

Table 3.1 lists those public relations activities which the legislative Public Information Officers indicated that they performed in behalf of individual state legislators.

Press Releases

Both Public Information Officers and other caucus staff

Table 3.1

Caucus Staff Performed Public Relations
Activities Mentioned by Caucus Staff
Public Information Officers

Activity	Mentioned	Not mentioned	Total
Press releases	4	0	4
Radio tapes	4	0	4
Speech writing	3	1	4
Handling constituent mail	2	2	4
Preparing election files	4	0	4
Advising on communications	3	1	4
Press conferences	4	0	4
Photo distribution	4	0	4

personnel write and distribute press releases for legislators. The majority of the work is initiated by the request of the individual legislator. However, the Public Information Officer may initiate a release and clear it with a legislator prior to releasing it for publication. Press releases have been the most visible public relations type activity of the caucus staffs to date. The releases are mailed to local constituency media outlets and occasionally distributed to the regulars of the Capitol Press Corps by placing the releases in designated folders in press release files in the Governor's office, the Attorney General's office, and the Capitol Press Room.

Radio Tapes

All four caucus staffs exhibited a recent interest in radio as a communication medium for legislative news. The Public Information Officers regard radio as an important, but often overlooked, medium for the dissemination of legislative news. Each caucus staff has equipped itself with tape recorders for recording "actualities" (short statements by legislators) which are then mailed or transmitted via telephone to various radio stations, primarily to stations in a legislator's district. The information officers think the radio tapes or "beepers" are being well received by the local stations.

Speech Writing

Both the information officers and other caucus staff personnel are available to draft, or to assist legislators in drafting, speeches. The caucus staff's key research function complements this activity by

providing information for the speech writer.

Handling Constituent Mail

Two of the information officers (see Table 3.1) noted the provision of assistance to legislators in answering constituent mail as a "public relations" function which they performed. The information officers referred to these letters as "case" mail. Such letters normally involve answering specific problems of constituents. The Public Information Officer or caucus staff member may draft the reply for a letter as a ghost writer or simply do the research for solving the problem.

Preparing Election Files

All four Public Information Officers stated that they are keeping files consisting of legislators' voting and attendance records to use in behalf of their own legislators in future election campaigns. Their files will provide material for campaign speeches, campaign press releases, and radio tapes.

Advising on Communications

This general heading of activity included the efforts of the Public Information Officers in educating legislators on how to get press attention, how to deal with reporters, and other such basic matters a legislator might seek assistance on in regard to his dealings with the media. The Public Information Officers felt that this educational aspect of their position was making for a more "sophisticated" exchange between the legislators and the media.

Press Conferences

A previous researcher found that legislators called fewer press conferences than did other public officials in Wisconsin.[1] But, if a legislator desires to call a press conference for the purpose of disseminating news, he can turn to his Public Information Officer for assistance. The information officer can arrange, announce, and set up the press conference for the legislator.

Photo Distribution

The Public Information Officers indicated that they have taken pictures, both glossy black and whites and color slides, which they distributed to newspapers and television stations. This is done to insure that pictures are available for use along with press releases and tapes. Television stations might occasionally use a slide-tape combination during a local newscast.

Time and Costs

During their interviews, the information officers revealed that their recording and photographic equipment had been provided by legislator donations in one case, and through the statewide party organization in the other three cases. So, according to their statements, this equipment is not paid for, in any way, by state tax funds. The four officers stated that the only state funds involved in the conduct of their public relations activities were in their salaries and office supplies.

The Public Information Officers estimated the time that their

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

caucus staffs' spent in the performance of public relations activities for legislators of their caucus. Their estimates are shown in Table 3.2. The differences in estimates revealed in Table 3.2 reflect the varying emphasis placed upon the public relations area by the four different caucus staffs. As noted earlier, each caucus staff operates as an autonomous entity. Yet, all four of the staffs do involve themselves directly in public relations activities (as shown by Table 3.1) on behalf of the legislators who make up the caucuses.

Table 3.2

PIO Estimate of Time Spent by His Caucus Staff in Public Relations Activity

Estimated time	Number estimating (N = 4)
25%	2
50%	1
60-75%	1
Total	4

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS NECESSITY

J. A. R. Pimlott wrote in his Public Relations and American Democracy of two basic arguments normally given to justify the practice of government public relations.

> Two main arguments can be advanced for government public relations. The first may be called the reporterial argument. A democratic government must report to the people. This does

[illegible] effect upon the performance of public relations activities for legislators or their staffs. These activities are shown in Table 1.4. The differences in activities revealed in Table 1.4 reflect the varying exposure placed upon the public relations staff by the four different-size districts. In every category, medium-size staff reported no or minimum activity. Yet, all three of the smaller in terms of Congressional districts in public relations activities (as shown in Table 1.4) in behalf of the legislators who were in the minority.

TABLE 1.4

THE DIFFERENCE OF TIME SPENT ON THE PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITY

Individual time	Number activities (N = 1)
100	0
200	1
50-100	1
Total	2

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS BROCHURE

Q. 1. 8. Problems arised in the Public Relations and Services

Designing of the basic organizing material given to persons in positions of government public relations.

Two main components may be advanced for government public relations. The first may be called the organizational brochure. A descriptive government must report to the people. This does

> not necessarily involve any element of persuasion. The second may be called the administrative argument. Certain administrative measures will not succeed unless the public or sections of the public are adequately informed about their rights and duties, or unless--foreign policy in some aspects is a good example--the public understands and acquiesces in them.[2]

The four legislative Public Information Officers advanced Pinlott's "repertorial argument" as justification for their caucus staff originated public relations activities. The information officers hold that it is their duty to inform the people of Wisconsin about the operations of their state government, particularly about the legislative branch of government. However, two of the Public Information Officers qualified their remarks by stating that they informed the people about their government by articulating a specific party's partisan point of view. That qualification portrays, as will be shown later, the reality of Wisconsin's partisan oriented legislative public relations activity.

According to the information officers, they have undertaken the public relations activities cited earlier for legislators because the legislators themselves lacked time to perform such activities. Moreover, the information officers felt that the legislators, for the most part, were inexperienced in the techniques of dealing with the media. One information officer expressed his response in this way:

> You have to realize that as complex as state government has gotten at this point, that the senators and representatives in the Assembly have a tremendous workload when you consider that they are paid on the basis of a part-time job. The idea of physically getting out releases for themselves is a job which would be, even if they were adept at it, too time consuming. They have too many other things to do when you consider the volume of legislation they have to consider, the amount of boning

up they have to do, to perform their function as a legislator properly. It is just an area where it is impossible for them to operate effectively. In the public relations field, they have to have help.

Table 3.3 shows the information officers' responses to the question if there was a need for press relations assistance on behalf of state legislators. One information officer responded that "there is a greater need than ever before." The different responses pointed out that the increasing complexity of state government and the rise of the state's governmental bureaucracy made it imperative that legislators receive as much staff assistance as possible. That staff assistance, as the information officers indicated, ought to include providing the legislator with assistance in the communication area. This communication activity is directed at creating an "informed public" which is supposed to be the backbone of the democratic governing process. The Public Information Officers depicted a need for persons who could "communicate" what is going on in the government to the public by translating the complexity of the governmental process into a form attractive to the public. Much of the public has only a passing interest in its government and this makes the communication task difficult.

The four Public Information Officers stated that, in their opinion, there was a definite need for themselves and their public relations activities. One Public Information Officer said:

> As state government gets more complex, as the issues get more complex, they will need people in between to insure that all the information gets through.

He added that "the better job we do, the more information is going to get out."

Table 3.3

PIOs' Opinion as to Whether There is a Need for Press Relations Assistance for State Legislators

Responses	Number responding (N = 4)
Yes	3
No	0
Depends	1
Total	4

The Chief Target

The caucus staff originated public relations activities have as their chief target the local constituencies of the individual state legislators. Press releases and radio tapes are sent to the local media outlets in a legislator's district. Weekly papers are held in high regard by the Public Information Officers for their utilization of the caucus staff-disseminated press releases.

Caucus staff information officers have little to do with the regular media reporters who constitute the Capitol Press Corps.[3] Occasionally, the information officers deal with the Capitol Press Corps by staging press conferences or by making copies of press releases available to them in the press release files of the Capitol

[illegible] Table [illegible] gives the data information in [illegible] [illegible]:

Table 5.7

Total Updates in Database Since [illegible]
for Three Relative Locations
for Three Implications

Implications	Relative Frequency (0 - 1)
Yes	1
No	[illegible]
Depends	1
Total	[illegible]

The Global Image

The choice which maximized relative frequency satisfying both the global relative budget the local requirements of the individual group implications. Three relations and their keys are sent to the local media consists in a Depositary's Journal. Media images are used to help respond by the Public Information Officers for their utilization of the various audio-illustrated group meetings.

Choice model information efficiency here claims to be some as regular media requirements and assumptions for Digital Image Group. Consequently, the information efficiency that will the Digital Image Group by adding group communication or by making copies of group relevance available to them in the group relevant files of the Digital

Press Room located between the Senate and Assembly chambers in the Capitol. Reporters sometimes individually approach a Public Information Officer in their newsgathering efforts looking for leads, facts, or background material. But, the Public Information Officers do not consider the reporters of the Capitol Press Corps as the chief targets of their public relations activities.

One information officer explained that he did not consider himself to be in competition with the Capitol Press Corps, but, saw himself as "complementing" the work done by Wisconsin's Capitol Press Corps. In that vein, the information officer sees himself disseminating information which otherwise would receive little or no attention from the Capitol Press Corps because of its localized interest. Members of the Capitol Press Corps tend to represent urban, metropolitan papers and electronic media outlets. The greatest number of reporters represent Madison, Milwaukee and Green Bay papers, radio and television stations. The Public Information Officers see themselves serving those media outlets (both print and electronic) which cannot afford to send reporters to cover the state legislature. The home districts of their legislator employers are the highest priority targets of the caucus staffs' public relations activities. This selective dissemination of caucus staff-originated public relations material serves to assist the legislator in filling his self-determined communication needs.

One caucus staff Public Information Officer argued that his activities, and those of the other information officers, made the

Capitol Press Corps more alert. To his mind, the information officers provided a check upon biased, inaccurate reporting by the Capitol regulars. Another information officer commented that the information officers were cutting down the "sensationalism" aspect of legislative news in Wisconsin by giving legislators "sophistication" in their dealings with the media.

Legislators Benefitting the Most

The Public Information Officers enumerated many types of legislators who derived the greatest benefit from the public relations activities of the caucus staffs. Table 3.4 lists those enumerations. By ambitious legislators, the information officers referred to legislators who had designs upon seeking higher elected office. For them, the public relations efforts helped generate a statewide name and a potential statewide constituency. Activist legislators were identified as being forceful personalities who managed to stay in the forefront of state legislative activity. Rural, or out-state, legislators benefit from the caucus staff public relations endeavors since their constituencies are often ignored by the statewide media covering the state legislature except for the wire services. The rural districts harbor the local media outlets, weekly newspapers and local radio stations, which the information officers believe to be receptive to their efforts. Freshman legislators derive benefit from the caucus staff public relations activity because of their newness to the legislative scene. The caucus staff's information officer can provide the freshman legislator with media relations knowledge which

Oneonta, Green Bay, Lake Geneva, and Stevens Point, Wisconsin, provided a clear case study. Interviews conducted in the Spring of 1980 with public information officers, community leaders, and legislators in these four communities, and with "knowledgeable" experts in Washington, D.C., provide some insights into the "behavioral" aspects of legislative bodies in dealing with legislative "initiatives" in their geographic areas of service.

Legislators Responsibility for Use

The Public Information Officers considered many types of legislators who declined the provided benefit from the public relations activities of the various units. Since it is often these communications, by definition legislators, the information officers referred to legislators who did designate their benefit clients as public citizens. In fact, the public relations officers helped provide a strategic and potentially advantageous communication.

Also as being directly communicated the message to what is the function of these legislative agencies. Then, in retrospect, legislators benefit from the review about public relations activities since their constituents are often impacted by the economic decisions affecting the state legislature across the-two year cycle. The most distinctive factor for local media relations, public responsibility and local radio stations, which the information officers believe to be receptive to their efforts. Personal interviews during January 1980 the review staff public relations activity tactics, of this agency in the legislative areas. The media priority information activity provide the freshman legislators with some relationship benefits which

can serve him in good stead for the duration of his legislative career. The non-activist legislator can benefit from the publicity exposure given by the caucus staff's public relations activities which he might otherwise not receive because of his retiring nature.

Table 3.4

Legislator Benefitting Most from the Caucus Staffs' Public Relations Efforts*

Type of legislator	Number of times mentioned
Ambitious	1
Activist	2
Rural	2
Freshman	2
Non-activist	1

*N = 4. The information officers were allowed to make more than one response.

Basically, it appears, according to the Public Information Officers, that a legislator can benefit from the public relations capabilities of the caucus staffs depending upon his own involvement and situation. The information officers felt that the legislator who realizes the capabilities of the caucus staff's assistance and tailors those capabilities to his political game-plan can derive the greatest benefit from those capabilities.

JUSTIFYING TAX SUPPORTED PUBLIC RELATIONS

As noted by Dr. Alan Rosenthal in his studies of the Wisconsin caucus staffs, those staffs have been the subject of controversy from the very beginning of their operation.[4] Some legislative leaders opposed the idea of tax money being utilized to support the provision of staffing for the political parties within the legislature. A similar argument has since been raised concerning the tax support given to the partisan public relations efforts of the political parties in the legislature through the state funded caucus staffs.

Table 3.5 presents the Public Information Officers' justification for the tax supported public relations activities of the caucus staffs.

Table 3.5

PIOs' Justification for Tax Support of Caucus Staff Public Relations Activities*

Justification	Number of times mentioned
Benefit to legislator	1
Informing the public of state legislative government	3
The partisan reality of the legislative process	1
The sophistication of the legislative process	1

*N = 4. The information officers were allowed to make more than one response.

One information officer commented in giving his response that:

> As far as government is concerned in our system, there is just no such thing as making too much information available at all. As long as it is information that has meaning and will help the man on mainstreet in formulating opinions and ideas on what he wants state government to do and on legislation he would like to see enacted, I think that it is then a valuable function.

Another Public Information Officer stated that:

> I feel that, basically, in a democracy, to make it work, you have to get as much information out, correct information, as often as you can . . . . That is the biggest thing, to get more and more people involved in the democratic process.

A third information officer claimed that the level of sophistication of legislative activity demanded specialized staff assistance for legislators, including their media dealings. He also stated that the public relations activity gave the legislators a tool by which they could agressively confront the executive branch of state government with alternatives to current policy.

The fourth Public Information Officer said that the justification for the tax supported information activities rested upon the benefit provided to the individual legislator. As he saw it, the public relations activities made for a better legislative process since the legislator, by communicating what he was doing and why he was doing it, encouraged informed participation by the public in the legislative process.

<u>The Partisanship Question</u>

James L. McCamy, in his <u>Government Publicity</u>, wrote that:

> Government publicity only provides one aspect of the citizen's news. It makes no effort to give complete analyses of social dilemmas, but only enters the competition with other one-sided

statements of events. In doing this, it conforms to the contemporary practice of representative government.[5]

McCamy's insight touches the heart of the partisan nature of Wisconsin's legislative public relations activity. The distinguishing characteristic of that activity is its partisan nature. The different caucus staffs concentrate on presenting the partisan positions of their legislator employers. Caucus staff personnel, including each staff's Public Information Officer, are hired for their political affiliation as well as their communication abilities and skills. They are expected to remain politically loyal to their caucus. Their partisan public relations efforts may compete, as McCamy put it, "with other one-sided statements of events," possibly of the same event, having been disseminated by an opposing caucus.

The Public Information Officers interviewed for this study considered the partisan nature of their public relations activity to be a strong point in its favor. The partisan nature, to their minds, allows a more dynamic, more realistic communication function which thereby fosters a more dynamic political process.

Table 3.6 lists the information officers comments regarding the advantages of partisan originated legislative public relations function. Table 3.7 lists their comments as to the disadvantages of a non-partisan legislative public relations function.

The information officers attribute both strength and merit to the partisan setup of Wisconsin's public relations activity in the legislature. One information officer stated, that because of the partisan arrangement:

[illegible] of [illegible]. In [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Table 3.6

PIOs' Opinion as to the Advantages of a Partisan Public Relations Function*

Advantages	Number of times mentioned
Allows aggressive reporting by caucus staff	1
Follows partisan nature of the legislature itself	2
Allows legislators to be more confident in presenting their views	2
Allows interest of participants to be a motivational factor	1

*N = 4. The information officers were allowed to make more than one response.

Table 3.7

PIOs' Opinion as to the Disadvantages of a Non-Partisan Public Relations Function*

Disadvantages	Number of times mentioned
Questionable loyalty	1
Lack of zeal on part of information personnel	1
Lack of freedom for legislator in expressing his views	1

*N = 3.

Table 3.0

Pilot opinion as to the advantages of a Training Public Relations Structure

Advantages	Number of times mentioned
Allows appropriate reporting to course chief	7
Relieves specialist staffs of the Jaggedness thereof	4
Allows implications to be made - conditions to promoting basic plans	3
Allows instructor of psychologists to be a motivational factor	3

$^{a}N = 10$. The individual citizens were listed to make sure none was forgotten.

Table 3.1

Pilot opinions as to the disadvantages of a Manufacturing Public Relations Structure

Disadvantages	Number of times mentioned
Unnecessary layering	3
Lack of real or pure or informations personnel	1
Lack of freedom for instructors to approaching the items	2

$^{a}N = 10$.

> We are in a better position to argue or explain the merits of a piece of legislation from the point of view of our legislator.

Another information officer argued that the partisanship nature balances itself out through equality.

> Even though the jobs are partisan, as long as each party in each house has its information officer, it balances out the partisanship factor. . . . Overall we get a pretty good outpouring of information which gives the public both sides.

Because of the partisan arrangement of the staffs, the loyalty of the Public Information Officer is "extremely important" in the performance of his job according to these Public Information Officers. As one information officer put it, "if they [the legislators] distrust you, you're dead." The trust relationship between the caucus information officer and the legislators he serves is all important. Apparently, the empathy of the Public Information Officer and his employers allows the information officer to work more diligently for the legislator when performing numerous communication activities in his behalf.

EFFECTS OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITY

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the recently established caucus staffs public relations programs is the impact of those activities upon the process by which legislative news is disseminated to the people of Wisconsin. This legislative news dissemination process is encompassed by the state's public information system. That system can be defined as the information system made up of various elements by which a person learns of the activity of his state government. Some elements of that system might be the state's own governmental communication apparatus (which includes its Public Information personnel);

the privately owned media within the state; and, the communication personnel and communication capabilities of special interest groups which often comment in some manner on state governmental activity. To an extent, the elements that constitute the state's public information system control what the citizen knows of his government's actions and workings.

Wisconsin's four legislative Public Information Officers considered themselves to be making a positive contribution to the state's "public information system" as defined above (see also Table 3.8). The information officers felt that they were able to disseminate information on legislative activity to the public which otherwise might not be disseminated. The information officers further claimed that through their attempts to "localize" news, or place it where it would be of greatest interest to the public, that they were supplementing the activities of the various media throughout the state. One information officer put it this way:

> I think we add to the number of sources [of information]. And, I always think that the more sources of information that you have, the more reliable the final picture will be.

A second information officer commented in this manner:

> We provide a service because all of what we do is not merely opinion, opinion of a legislator or our caucus. There is straight hard fact we try to tell the people and explain in simple terms, as well as possible, what we are attempting to do; how government operates, for example, what the procedures and vehicle is through which a budget has to go before it is finally enacted into law. We try to, in the course of our stories, explain how government operates and what the procedures are.

A third information officer explained his response along these lines:

Many of the things we put out are informational columns, basically used by the weekly newspapers. People who get the weekly newspapers read them pretty much cover to cover. A lot of people use that [weekly newspaper] as their basic source of information. Frequently our legislators put out information columns on different aspects of state government, where to go and things of that nature. These are strictly informational and non-partisan almost all the time.

The information officers emphasized their feelings that they do perform a service for the people of Wisconsin by making information on state legislative activity available.

Table 3.8

PIOs' Opinions as to Whether Their Activities Make a Contribution to the State's Public Information System*

Responses	Number responding (N = 4)
Yes	4
No	0
Depends	0
Total	4

*The state's public information system was defined as being that system by which a citizen learns of the activities of his state government.

However, the Public Information Officers do not see themselves as "gatekeepers" in the flow of legislative news in Wisconsin. The information officers acknowledged that they can influence the manner in which information goes out, how things are worded and written, but,

essentially they see themselves as disseminating an individual legislator's ideas. In fact, the Public Information Officers attribute the "gatekeeper" role to the media representatives who ultimately decide to use or not to use press releases or radio tapes supplied to them. Furthermore, the information officers do not envision themselves as "funnels" through which all legislative news flows. And, accordingly, they do not consider themselves to be buffers or barriers between the media and the legislators. As one information officer said, "I'm not a press secretary for X number of legislators." The accessibility of legislators and the dependency of legislators upon the media for publicity and the dissemination of their ideas, precludes, to a great extent, a structured news flow through an information officer.

Douglass Cater wrote in his The Fourth Branch Of Government that:

> The American legislator, uniquely among the parliamentarians of the world, is sensitively alert to the business of systematic press relations.[6]

One of the facts of life of the legislator-press relationship in Wisconsin's Legislature is the almost daily interaction of media reporters and legislators.[7] Most reporters view the caucus staff Public Information Officers (see Chapter 5) as an extra step in their newsgathering efforts. So, Capitol Press Corps reporters have little to do with the legislative information officers. Moreover, many legislators prefer to deal personally with reporters and that preference coupled with their own accessibility limits the scope of the information officer's position to that of a technician. Some legislators simply

utilize the Public Information Officer's proficiency in preparing items for the media and raly on themselves to deal directly with the Capitol Press Corps and other reporters.

Table 3.9 portrays the opinions of the Public Information Officers as to their effect upon the flow of legislative news to the public. All four information officers believed that their efforts had significantly increased the amount of news about state legislative activity reaching the public through the various media. One information officer said:

> We complement, we are an adjunct to the press, and they are primarily responsible for the flow of information, particularly those who cover the capitol, and we enhance that coverage.

A second information officer expressed his point in these words:

> We have provided substantially more news and information, not only to the weekly and daily papers, but also to radio stations. I think, in fact, we have, to a great extent, been responsible for getting information to the public not only by those sources but also by providing information directly to them.
>
> I think one area we have perhaps forgotten, we've gotten into a situation where many legislators now have a regular means of reporting to their constituents, whether it be through the press with a news column or via newsletters. We many times provide the information or, in fact, write those newsletters, those news columns. So that there is, in fact, a steady flow of news back to a district, either directly back or through the press . . . . We've increased this area of activity by the legislator substantially. We've gotten them into the position where they are now making regular and often in depth reports of legislative activity instead of the spontaneous news release.

The four Public Information Officers considered themselves to be effective channels for the legislator desiring to communicate information to the public through the media (see Table 3.10). According to one information officer:

Table 3.9

PIOs' Opinions as to Their Effect
Upon the Legislative News Flow

Responses	Number responding (N = 4)
Increased flow	4
Decreased flow	0
No effect upon flow	0
Total	4

Table 3.10

PIOs' Opinion as to Whether the PIO is an
Effective Channel for a Legislator
Desiring to Communicate
Via the Media

Responses	Number responding (N = 4)
Yes	4
No	0
Depends	0
Total	4

> Primarily, because we have the experience and the expertise in the field of journalism and we have an acquaintanceship with the needs of the press, we're in the position to supplement the activity of a legislator in an area that he has probably not had an occasion to develop expertise.

Another information officer who considered himself to be an effective channel for a legislator who desired to communicate with constituents via the media explained his belief in this statement:

> I think so, /that the Public Information Officer is an effective channel/ mainly because we know the press. I think one thing I've found out is how much very bad information there is in legislators' minds about the press; who the press are. They might know a few reporters but they don't know who the rest are. And, they don't understand deadlines, good news days, bad news days, how to stage a press conference effectively, or how to insure that information gets out in the proper form.

The information officer's effectiveness seems to hinge upon his knowledge of dealing with the media and also upon his ability to put that knowledge to work for his legislator employers. Wisconsin's legislative bureaucracy admits in its practice that communication specialists are valuable in their own right, at least as the legislators who authorize their employment see it.

The PIOs and the Press

An important aspect of the Public Information Officer's job is his perceived relationship with the press. Statements made by the information officers and cited earlier in this study pointed out that the information officers did not see themselves as competitors with the press but merely as persons "complementing" or "supplementing" the press in its work of reporting legislative news. Table 3.11 shows the Public Information Officers' views as to the function of the press

in covering state legislative activity. The information officers felt that the press was responsible for letting the people know, in a non-partisan way, what was going on in the state legislature. Legislative activity, according to one of the information officers, "articulated" the details of public policy formulation, and, the press serves to make that formulation process visible to the people.

Table 3.11

PIOs' Opinion as to the Function of the Press in Reporting State Legislative Activity

Response	Number responding (N = 4)
Objectively exposing legislative activity	4
Total	4

However, the information officers were not hesitant to single out areas of deficiency, as they saw them, in the press's coverage of the state legislature. Table 3.12 lists three specific areas of deficiency on the part of the press in its coverage of the legislature as seen by the four legislative Public Information Officers.

Two information officers remarked on the press's inability to "cover it all" in reference to the complex and widely ranging business of the state legislature. The volume of potential "news" emanating from within the legislature simply overwhelms the limited resources, both space and personnel, of the press.[8] This volume of activity

is correctly where Jacksonian politics. The Jacksonian officials felt that the press was responsible for letting the people know, in a democratic society, what was going on in the state legislature. Legislative activity, according to one of the Jacksonian officials, "[illegible] the details of public policy [illegible]" and, in order, allowed to make wise Democratic judgments [illegible] on the people.

TABLE [illegible]

TOTAL [illegible] ON THE [illegible] OF THE PRESS BY SUPPORTING STATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

Response	Number responding (N = [illegible])
Supporting legislative activity	[illegible]
TOTAL	[illegible]

However, the Jacksonian officials were not inclined to [illegible] any sense of delicacy, as they saw them, in the press's covering of the state legislature. TABLE [illegible] [illegible] sense of delicacy on the part of the press in the coverage of the legislature as seen by the [illegible] PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER.

The Jacksonian officers [illegible] on the press's inability to "[illegible] in [illegible] to the events and [illegible] [illegible] of the state legislature. The nature of [illegible] "[illegible]" [illegible] from within the legislature simply overshadow the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], of the press.[illegible] The nature of [illegible]

causes much detail of legislative government to be neglected by the press. Wisconsin's legislative information officers see themselves as trying to provide that too often cut "detail" to the local public through their press releases and radio tapes.

Table 3.12

PIOs' Opinion of Press Deficiencies in its Coverage of the State Legislature*

Response	Number of times mentioned
Superficiality of coverage	2
Inaccuracy	1
Objectivity	1

*N = 4.

The information officer who cited the objectivity of the press as a deficiency stated that the deficiency lay in that the "press was limited in expressing political views on issues." For him, the objectivity of the press, its neutral reporting position, sterilized the dynamics of the partisan legislative process in its news coverage.

Wisconsin's caucus staff Public Information Officers were aware of problems confronting the media reporter trying to cover the activity of the state legislature. Table 3.13 enumerates some of those problems as seen by the information officers.

Table 3.13

PIOs' Opinion of Problems Confronting State Legislative Reporters*

Problems	Number of times mentioned
Volume and complexity of activity to be covered	3
Lack of time	3
Lack of adequate media personnel	1
Boredom	1
Bias of paper	1

*N = 4. The information officers were allowed to make more than one response to the question.

One information officer (see Table 3.13) specified that the bias of a reporter's paper (or any reporter's media organization) was a problem confronting a reporter in his coverage of the state legislature. By that he meant that a media organization by emphasizing special areas of interest in legislation or legislative activity pushed its reporters to that area to the neglect of other areas of importance within the legislative sphere. Moreover, boredom, as a problem confronting legislative reporters, was mentioned as such by another information officer. He stated that the continual struggle of a legislative reporter with similar problems from day to day and from one legislative session to another created a boredom which a reporter had to contend with on a personal level.

Table 3.1:

Effect Ignition of Problem Identifying
State Legislative Supervisors*

Activities	Number of times mentioned
Volume and complexity of activity to be covered	1
Lack of time	1
Lack of adequate audio personnel	1
Formula	1
Size of paper	1

*N = 1. The information activities were elicited in open ended questions in the questionnaire.

One information activity (see Table 3.1) specified that the size of a reporter's paper (or any respondent's audio equivalent) was a problem modifying a reporter in his coverage of the state legislature. It may be more than a mere coincidence to indicate special areas of concern in legislative or legislative-related areas of interest in the paper or audio equivalent. In fact, the importance attributed to that area in the report or other areas of importance within the legislative sphere. However, however, in a problem concerning legislative reporters, was mentioned as one in another information activity. In stated that the additional coverage of a legislative reporter with another problem. Thus, the in the and that the legislative session be further limited to however which a reporter had to contend with on a personal level.

Table 3.14 gives the Public Information Officers' rating of the press coverage given the Wisconsin Legislature. None of the information officers rated the coverage in a derogatory manner. One information officer stated that the press coverage could be better, but, the constant turnover of legislative reporters worked to the detriment of the overall quality of legislative reporting.[9] The same information officer stated that the present group of legislative reporters was better than those of the past.

Table 3.14

PIOs' Rating of the Press Coverage of the Wisconsin Legislature

	Pretty good	Good	Average	Total
Number responding (N = 4)	1	1	2	4

The PIOs' View of Themselves

The caucus staff Public Information Officers felt that the public relations activities of the caucus staffs were pretty well developed. They saw the activity as undergoing refinement. The four information officers believed they had reached a plateau in terms of actual development of the public relations function within their respective staffs. Now they face, as they put it, a problem of doing what they do more effectively. A concern is shared by the information officers in doing more for the electronic media, especially

Table [illegible] gives the Public Information officers' rating of the Fleet overall plus the [illegible] departments. Here we see information officers rated the average in a [illegible] manner. The information officer stated that the [illegible] would be better, but the [illegible] tendency of Logistics personnel [illegible] to the [illegible] of the overall quality of information [illegible]. The [illegible] information officer stated that the primary [illegible] of logistics [illegible] rapportness was [illegible] [illegible] of the fleet.

Table [illegible]

Fleet Rating of the Fleet Overall
by the Elements Departments

	Fleet Rating Good	Good	Average	Total
Fleet Overall (N = [illegible])	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

The Fleet View of Themselves

The Naval Staff Public Information officers felt that the Public Relations Activities of the Fleet were [illegible] [illegible]. They saw the activity as [illegible] [illegible]. The Fleet Information officers believed that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of Naval Headquarters or the public [illegible] [illegible] that responsible [illegible]. The [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] of doing that [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] to [illegible] by the Information officers in doing [illegible] for the [illegible] [illegible], [illegible]

television. Besides, they also share an interest in turning out more in-depth press releases and longer radio tapes.

One information officer stated that he was attempting to do away with the emphasis given to publicizing bill introductions which normally flood the press release files at the opening of a new legislative session. The same information officer added that he wanted to focus on more "factual" pieces and de-emphasize the "rhetoric" pieces coming from legislators of his caucus.

The information officers singled out areas of future concern for themselves during the course of the interviews. They mentioned the continual problem of making meaning out of complexity; coping with an ever increasing "information explosion"; and, the problems involved with attempting to better utilize the electronic media in their activities. The "information explosion" accounts for their biggest problems. Wisconsin's legislative information officers are finding it more and more difficult to distill complex issues and make them understandable to the general public via the media. The avalanche of available data on various issues swamps one's attempt to keep up with everything on the issue.

Over the long run, the Public Information Officers hope to effect a change in the public's "generally held image" of the state legislature. All four of the information officers described that currently held image as "bad" but, they do not feel that their efforts to date have done anything to alter that generally held image. They think that their efforts will effect a change in that image over time.

The first steps in bringing about such a change have already taken place. Legislators have made themselves more visible through their caucus staff-supported communication endeavors.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 3

[1]Delmar Delano Dunn, "Interaction Between The Press And Wisconsin State Officials" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967), p. 354.

[2]J. A. R. Pimlott, Public Relations And American Democracy (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951), p. 76.

[3]See The Wisconsin Blue Book 1970, p. 349, for a list of the news media representatives covering the 1969 legislative session. This author used this list initially in selecting the "regulars" of the Capitol Press Corps as potential interviewees for this study and then updated the list through interviews with the newsmen themselves.

[4]See Alan Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin" (manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Robison), September, 1969, pp. 16-17.

[5]James L. McCamy, Government Publicity (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 18.

[6]Douglass Cater, The Fourth Branch of Government (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), p. 53.

[7]See Dunn's, "Interaction Between The Press And Wisconsin State Officials," for a description of legislator-reporter interaction in their daily work. This author observed both formal and informal contacts of legislators and media reporters. On occasion, legislators shared with reporters data upon which they were basing their arguments in floor debate. Legislators and reporters could be observed talking informally throughout the day as legislative work progressed. These conversations occurred in many different locations in and about the Capitol. Reporters and legislators often frequented the same restaurants for the noon meal while the legislature was in session and this permitted both reporters and legislators who were so inclined to exchange the latest legislative "intelligence" which supports the newsgathering process at the Capitol.

[8]The Columbia Journalism Review, Winter, 1969-1970, Vol. VIII, No. 4, 2, listed state legislatures as one of the ten "institutional" stories least covered by American journalism. The Review urged journalists to move beyond mere spot news reporting to, "among other things, reporting on human institutions." The media appear lacking in their ability and desire to cover state legislatures.

[9]Dunn, "Interaction Between The Press And Wisconsin State Officials," pp. 85-86.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 3

[1] Walter Nelson Dean, "Interactions Between the Press and Government Since Officially Supplanted the, Ed. Guanchelsen, University of Wisconsin, 1967), p. 75.

[2] A. R. Fenlon, Public Relations and Lobbying Techniques (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Advertising Press, 1971), p. 9.

[3] See The Elements Size Book 1971, p. 51, for a list of the more media representatives covering the 1967 legislature session. This source was used with some caution in studying the "quality" of the Capital Press Corps as personal interviews in this study and even opposed the later through interviews with the session legislators.

[4] See also Greenfield, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Minnesota" (unpublished research for the Tension and Consequence of Legislative Change," written by Thomas Anderson, Minnesota, 1967, pp. 16-17.

[5] Dean L. Yarwood, Government Relations (Colorado Springs: University of Colorado Press, 1971), p. 46.

[6] Douglass Cater, The Fourth Branch of Government (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972), p. 52.

[7] See Dean's, "Interactions Between the Press and Legislative State Officials," for a description of legislative-reporter interaction in their daily work. This author observed that formal and informal contacts of legislators and media reporters. On occasion, legislators shared site reporters into open which they were meeting their schedules in other ways. Legislators and reporters could be observed talking informally throughout the day as legislative work progressed. These conversations ranged in many different topics of and about the legislature. Reporters and legislators often frequented the same restaurants for the noon meal while the legislature was in session and this practice was popular with reporters and legislators who were in position to encourage the latest legislative "tidbits" which reporters the newsgathering process as the Capital.

[8] The Colorado Journalism Review, Winter, 1969-1970, Vol. VIII, No. 2, stated with legislators on one of the two "legislators" stories issued by Jerrious Synodics. The Journal added journalists to serve beyond mere spot news reporting to "long range coling, reporting on broad institutions." The media appear lacking in their ability and desire to cover state legislatures.

[9] Dean, "Interactions Between the Press and Minnesota State Officials," pp. 55-60.

Chapter 4

WISCONSIN LEGISLATORS VIEW THEIR LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC RELATIONS FUNCTION

Wisconsin's four legislative caucus staffs were initially created to assess the value of "personalized" staff support for state legislators. Prior to 1965, Wisconsin legislators could obtain non-partisan staff support from several non-partisan legislative service agencies. Among the agencies providing such support were the Legislative Reference Bureau and the Legislative Council. The provision of staff support in the form of one research analyst per caucus in 1965 heralded a new emphasis by the legislature in its staffing pattern. That emphasis focused on increasing the assistance furnished to state legislators by providing them with a personal staff of some sort. The national drive for legislative modernization had as one of its targets, and still has as a target, improving the lot of the individual state legislators. Not so long ago in Wisconsin, legislators were expected to conduct all their business from their desks in their respective chambers. They were not given office space. Legislators had access to clerical help in the form of a "typing pool" in which a legislator shared the time of one or two secretaries with four or more other legislators. Legislators often found themselves forced into providing their own clerical help at their own place of employment, doing the work themselves, or simply doing

Chapter 1

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THIS CONSTITUENCY

STUDY REGARDING POLITICS

Throughout this introductory chapter briefly some initiative exerted to assess the value of "pork-barrelling" which support the state legislatures. Prior to 1960, Tasmanian legislatures would easily have purchase which supports that argument commonwealth legislative caucus expected. During the Tasmanian primaries were engaged when the inter-relations between Parties and the Legislature Council. The provisions of which support in the light of all relevant matters pertinent to LHC included a low emphasis by the legislature in the activities policies. That emphasis focused on increasing the remaining financial to state legislatures by providing them with a personal staff of their work. The national curve for legislative accomplishment has on one of the budgets and still has as a larger, regarding the lack of the institutions which legislatures. But as long ago in Tasmania Legislature Council reported to members all major business from their state in their respective electorate. They also not cross-action agency legislatures had access to clerical help in the form of a "typing pool" in order a legislature defined the time of the of the executive with their or more other legislatures. Legislators often found themselves forced into providing their own clerical help at their own place of employment, doing the work themselves, or hiring some

without. Because legislators had to concern themselves with many routine clerical chores they had to divert their time from more important aspects of their legislative duties such as research and evaluation of pending legislation.

Those conditions have slowly been alleviated. Legislators were given office space in the Capitol when other Administration personnel moved into new quarters. More secretarial help was furnished. At most, two legislators now share one secretary who answers phones, keeps appointment calendars, types, and performs other clerical type duties.

The establishment of the caucus staffs took the effort to improve the lot of the legislator one step further. The caucus staffs gave partisan assistance to legislators in research, bill analysis, and public relations. Since the separate caucuses controlled the hiring of their staff personnel they emphasized hiring individuals for their political leanings as well as for their requisite skills. The most recent thrust in the legislative staff assistance area has been into the area of individual staff for legislators. Some legislators now have individual full-time administrative assistants who work totally for them as directed. That trend is likely to increase in the future.

This chapter will present the attitudes and opinions of several legislative leaders concerning the legislative public relations function being carried on by their caucus staff Public Information Officers. A total of seven legislators were actually interviewed.

activity. Because legislators had to execute bargaining with many
competing financial interests they had to adopt their time more
expansive aspects of their legislative duties such as research and
evaluation of pending legislation.

These conditions were already been eliminated. Legislators
now spend little effort appeal to the electorate when making legislative
particularly social-life and questions. More successful high-tech industrial
At least, the legislatures also have more accessibility and economic planning,
large organizations celebrations, tours, and particular other electoral voting
matters.

The accomplishment of the Jackson Activity Board has allowed to
approve this law of the Legislature and only provided. The Jackson Activity
have particular assistance or implications in research, this research,
and public relations. Since the organizer attempted contribution the
activity of their staff personnel using organizational strategy information
for their political lawmaker to meet in the years regulative action.
The main reason behind to the Legislature staff assistance have to
been into the area of traditional staff to assistance. Some state-
level and have individual full-time consultative assistance for
more activity for them to interview. This trend is likely to increase
in the future.

The studies will present the attitudes and behavior of
general legislative leaders between the traditional public relations
functions being carried out by their staff and staff public information
officers. A model of power legislature have actually interviewed.

Eight legislators were initially designated by the author as respondents for the study. The eight legislators were the majority and minority leaders in both the Senate and Assembly, a total of four; and, the four caucus chairmen. However, the minority leader in the Assembly could not make himself available for an interview due to a heavy workload which arose during the interviewing phase of this research. The attitudes and opinions of those legislative leaders may aid in the construction of a generalized "legislator's" conception of the need for such a public relations function; the "legislator's" justification for such a function; and, from the "legislator's" point of view, the impact of that function upon the traditional flow of legislative news to the public.

Wisconsin's legislators are the generating force in the interaction of themselves, their Public Information Officers, and media reporters brought about by the caucus staffs' public relations activities. Therefore, the "legislator's" motivations and his reasons for emphasizing communication in his job are important factors in the explanation of why the legislative public relations function has emerged in Wisconsin's Legislature.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS NECESSITY

Most legislators, by virtue of their elective representative positions, become aware of the importance of communication in the performance of their legislative tasks. Classically, a popularly elected government represents its constituencies by maintaining a

political dialogue with the constituents. The constituents make known their "public opinion" and the elected representatives act upon the desires of "public opinion." V. O. Key described the communication function inherent to popular government in his Public Opinion And American Democracy:

> The conception of popular government as interaction between public opinion and government assumes a two-way flow of communication between the citizen and government.[1]

To win elective office, a legislator must communicate his ideas and beliefs on political issues so as to persuade the public to support him in his drive to win his election. A legislator's role further entails that he explain his legislative actions to constituents who elected him so as to maintain or win over their support for his actions. William Robson pointed out that requirement in his The Governors and the Governed. Robson argued that government cannot long operate successfully if its activities are veiled in ignorance, misunderstanding and mystery. He wrote that:

> Public authorities must come into the market place and tell the people simply and clearly what they are trying to do and why.[2]

Robson's argument can be translated to include legislators among the category of "public authorities." Legislators face the same responsibility as other public authorities of explaining their actions. Wisconsin's legislators, through their supporting caucus staffs, have equipped themselves to better enter Robson's "market place" and explain to the people their actions and goals. Moreover, as the American Institute For Political Communication noted in its

study of The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship, "the selective generation of political information is among the tools by which those in power seek to influence mass opinion."[3] Wisconsin's legislators are not unaware of the power that communication can exert in the governing process.

The goal of Wisconsin's legislative public relations function is a bringing together of legislator and constituents to inform the constituents and, hopefully, thereby enhance the re-election chances of the incumbent legislator. Stanley Kelley, Jr., wrote in Professional Public Relations And Political Power concerning the growing role of the public relations practitioner in politics, especially in campaigning:

> It is into the fundamental relationship between politician and electorate, between those who seek power and those who bestow authority, that the public relations man inserts himself, seeking to guide the action of the politician toward the people and the people toward the politician.[4]

Kelley described the political public relations man in terms of performing an accommodation function. That accommodation function is the goal of public relations efforts generally. The public relations man operating in the political realm moves to bring together the man seeking elective office, or seeking to retain elective office, and the potential electors.

The legislative leaders interviewed for this study enumerated several factors which they thought influenced the caucus staffs move into the public relations/communication area. One such factor mentioned by the legislators was a desire on the part of legislators

to do a better job of communicating with constituents. Some legislators, according to the legislative leaders, demanded assistance in the area of public relations. Another factor directly related to the legislators' demand for help in this area was the recognition on their part that they were too pressed for time by heavy workloads to do much for themselves in public relations, and, most of them were inept and inexperienced in such matters. Assistance in the public relations area would involve someone experienced in communication via the news media. The legislative leaders indicated that another factor was the hope and belief of individual legislators that such communication activities might aid them in future attempts to secure re-election. As one legislative leader responded, "politics is the art of communication and persuasion, and today the easiest way to communicate with large numbers of people is via the mass media." Another legislative leader explained the movement of his party's caucus staff into the public relations area in this way:

> Political survival reasons dictated that we give a hand to the legislator in his home district. This [the communication activities] made for greater utility on the part of the caucus staff than if they were working on legislation alone.

Table 4.1 lists the opinions of the legislative leaders as to the function which the caucus staff Public Information Officer is supposed to perform for the individual caucus member. Basically, the respondents thought that the Public Information Officer was supposed to play an active role in assisting legislators with any and all communication activities which the legislator sought assistance on. The bulk of the communication activities would be aimed at the

legislator's constituency, or so the legislative leaders thought. One goal of the communication activity was to enhance the re-election chances of the incumbent legislator.

Table 4.1

Legislators' Opinions as to the Function which the PIO Is Supposed to Perform for the Individual Legislator*

Responses	Number mentioning (N = 6)
Assist legislator in communicating with constituents	5
Assist legislator's political survival through communication efforts	3

*Not all legislators were asked this question. Legislators were allowed to make more than one response.

The legislator's communication with constituents, as one legislative leader stated, is his "political blood." Such communication is important because any creation of public support resulting from communication with constituents can be instrumental in furthering the legislator's political survival. All the legislators interviewed for this study considered communication with constituents via the mass media to be important. One legislator commented that:

> It is extremely important . . . . It makes him a better legislator. It makes for a better informed electorate. And, the combination of those two makes the whole system work better.

The legislative leaders held that not only was communication with constituents important, but also that the Public Information

Officer, by performing these communication activities in the legislator's behalf, assisted the legislators in the performance of their jobs. The Public Information Officer serves the individual legislator by saving him time which the legislator can then use in areas other than preparing communication for his constituents. Furthermore, the information officer can assist legislators in explaining their positions on specific legislation to the public through the public relations activities. Consequently, that explanation function may have bearing on the legislator's winning or losing public support. The legislative leaders generally believed that if the Public Information Officer performed his tasks creditably that those tasks might possibly evoke a "feedback" from a legislator's constituents. The leaders thought that other legislators had a high regard for such "feedback" or constituent response in making up their minds on issues. One of the legislative leaders argued that the Public Information Officer, if operating at maximum capability, forced a legislator to perform more responsibly. He said:

> If the Public Information Officer were functioning in an optimum fashion . . . . I think it forces a legislator to act in a more responsible fashion. You can't be a low profile legislator . . . . I think that is one thing a Public Information Officer can do and that is to give a legislator exposure. He can give us his voice on tape or an interview on television occasionally. The public then has a better chance to appraise, to assess his efforts in their behalf.

Listed in Table 4.2 are the opinions of the legislative leaders regarding why they believe that the Public Information Officer and his public relations activities are necessary. Douglass Cater stated in his <u>The Fourth Branch Of Government</u> that:

> The Member of Congress is uniquely creator and creature of publicity. It is the nature of his job to be concerned with that amorphous substance known as public opinion, and with the processes by which the public attention is attracted and public opinion shaped.[5]

Cater's statement adds another dimension to the explanations of the legislative leaders as to the need for the information officers.

Table 4.2

Legislators' Opinions as to why the Public Relations Activities of the Public Information Officer and Caucus Staff are Necessary*

Responses	Number responses (N = 7)
To inform constituents	5
To enhance a legislator's re-election chances	3
The complexity of the legislator's job	2
Legislator ineptness in dealing with mass media	1

*Legislators were allowed to make more than one response.

The legislative leaders emphasized the need and the right of the individual to knowledge of their elected government leaders and to knowledge of government activity generally. They also made reference to the communication function entwining the leaders and the led in representative government. In addition, the legislative leaders acknowledged that a legislator could benefit from the information officer's public relations activities through saved time and the

enhancement of his name for future election efforts. One legislator responded that the activities were necessary:

> To inform the constituents of what their legislator is doing. That is the right of the constituent to begin with. Without communication, they will have no knowledge and consider that nothing is happening, that the legislator is sitting on his duff in Madison doing nothing. So that is one reason, just getting information out to educate constituents. Secondly, to thereby, hopefully, better sell the legislator with his constituents, those who voted for him or even against him, in the hope that he might therefore be re-elected.

Table 4.3 presents the legislative leaders' opinions as to the need for press relations assistance for state legislators. Those legislators who specified that some sort of assistance along those lines was necessary argued from the point that communication with constituents was required by their office. Moreover, as one legislator said, "the story has to be told in the way we see the story." He felt that the various media did not protray his position as they should so he had an obligation to do so. Another legislator responded that such assistance was necessary because:

> You've got farmers who come here [to the legislature], and butchers, bakers, and lawyers. Most of them don't know how to write press releases.

A third legislator answered that there was such a need and the need was:

> To let my people know, as a representative of a particular district, of what I'm doing here, how I'm doing it, and why. In the case of a legislative leader like myself the need is to let the people of Wisconsin know the same.

The sole legislator who responded negatively to the question qualified his statement by remarking that there was a need for assistance in other areas such as the research and analysis area.

unnecessary efforts made for future educational efforts. One legislator responded that his experiences were satisfactory:

> To improve the conditions of this body legislation is doing. This is the right of the constituent to begin with. Without representation, they will have no knowledge of legislative laws. Getting is happening, that the legislature is acting as the duty in making doing meaning. We that to the people just getting information out to educate constituents. Personally, to improve, legislation, better will the legislature give the constituents, those who voted for him or who spoke against him, in the steps that he must therefore be remembered.

Table 6.1 presents the legislative leaders' opinions as to the need for great additional involvement for their legislators. Three legislators who specified that some sort of involvement along these lines was necessary stated that the period that accompanying with overtimes was required by their office. However, as one legislator later said, this alone did not be valid in his job as one has been, be that when the reviews would did not provide as their should as be had as obligations to do so. Another legislator recommended that more assistance was necessary because:

> Here's you finance and some here. Of the legislature, and business, income, and taxpayers. Most of them don't come to office great salaries.

A third legislator answered that there was not much a need for the need was:

> To let my people know, as a representative of a particular district, of what I'm doing here. Now I'm doing my job. As the case of a legislative leader like myself the need is to let the people of Alaska know the case.

The male legislator was responsible especially in the committee qualified his achievement by remarking that there was a need for assistance in other areas such as the research and analysis area.

He simply felt that press relations by itself was too small an area of activity to rate full-time staff attention.

Table 4.3

Legislators' Opinions as to Whether There is a Need for Press Relations Assistance for State Legislators

Responses	Number responding (N = 7)
Yes	4
No	1
Depends	2*
Total	7

*The two legislative leaders indicating that it "depends" contended that such assistance is a "distinct assist" but since legislators previously got along without that assistance they could do the same in the future.

Most of the legislative leaders, five of the seven interviewed, stated that they felt a definite need for the position of Public Information Officer within the caucus staffs and they also felt the need of his public relations services. The remaining two legislators stated that there was not an absolute need for the information officers but having them was a distinct advantage. One commented that it all really depended upon the kind of service that the constituents desired from their legislators. He felt that the Public Information Officer made for a better public accounting of a legislator's legislative performance. But, he questioned whether the public wanted that public accounting.

[illegible] opinions in an American Poll in 1[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

The Chief Target

The legislative leaders agreed with their Public Information Officers that the public relations efforts of the caucus staffs are primarily aimed at the local constituencies of the individual legislator. However, a few legislative leaders responded that that was not necessarily true for legislators in leadership positions. As one leader put it:

> For the legislator who is in a leadership capacity, such as myself, your targets are not only your constituents but perhaps also your congressional district area, or statewide, especially if your statement reflects the position taken by the group you represent.

A few legislative leaders described the targets of the public relations efforts of the information officers in terms of specific media outlets serving their constituencies. In those instances, the target depended upon the types of media outlets serving the constituent district. For example, some legislative leaders described the cities of Madison and Milwaukee as good targets for radio oriented public relations activities but poor targets as far as press oriented material went. They felt that way because both cities are served by their own morning and evening newspapers which have full-time legislative reporters covering legislative activity. They had found that the papers of the two cities were not receptive to press releases. Besides, the two cities by themselves generate much hard news and there is, evidently, aggressive competition among many public relations and publicity efforts for the limited space given such material by the papers' editors. Rural areas, on the other hand, were considered by

The Public Trust

The legislative leaders spoke with such a "Public Information" different that the public relations activity of the Senate should be primarily aimed at the local constituencies of the individual legislators. However, in the Legislative Leaders' responses this did not necessarily mean the legislators in leadership positions. As one leader put it:

> For the legislature who is in a leadership capacity, such as speaker, your budgets are not only your constituents but perhaps also your colleagues. Districts aren, or statewide, especially if your statement indicates the position taken by the group you represent.

A few legislative leaders described the majority of the public relations activity of the institution activities in terms of specific media events involving their constituents. In these instances, the leaders depended upon the types of local media serving the constituent districts. For example, some Legislative Leaders described the activities of students and volunteers as good targets for media-oriented public relations activities and gave examples as the 4-H groups coming to town. They felt that they could receive their message out personally by talking to media and meeting constituents which have direct-case legislative objectives concerning legislative activities. They had found that the power of the bus strike was not convincing to press releases. Besides, the two activity by businessmen concerned small business, to, probably, appropriate competitions among many public relations and politicity efforts for the limited space given more deployment by the primary activities. Their views, as the other leaders, were considered by

the legislators, as well as by their Public Information Officers, to be very receptive to the caucus staff-originated public relations material. One legislator indicated that his caucus also had as a target those constituencies which it did not carry in the past election but felt the party should have. In that case, the caucus leadership directed that the Public Information Officer saturate those areas with their party position on all legislation to get their point across and perhaps regain enough public support to win those districts in the next election.

Legislators Benefitting the Most

Table 4.4 portrays the opinions of the legislative leaders participating in this study as to which legislator, or type of legislator, derived the most benefit from the Public Information Officers' public relations efforts. An ambitious legislator, as referred to by the respondents, was an agressive, publicity conscious legislator. The legislative leaders considered as rural legislators all those legislators from districts not serviced by their own legislative reporters. The leaders also felt that a non-activist legislator derived benefit from the caucus staffs' public relations activities. By a non-activist legislator, they referred to a legislator who was less well able to perform his own communication efforts through the media.

A few legislative leaders quickly made clear that they personally did not rely upon the Public Information Officers for assistance in communication via the media. This was so for several

the Legislature, as well as by their Public Information Officers, to be very receptive to the media and to provide public relations services. One Legislator indicated that his albums show he is a keeper than a newsmaker which is not true in the past. Elections has kept very busy since then. In such cases, the media handsomely advertised this. The media increasingly covered events which their party produced so as increasing in the public eyes and perhaps regain member public support to the degree distributed in the best light.

Legislators Benefitted the Most

Table 4.4 portrays the opinions of the Legislative Leaders participating in this study as to which Legislature, or type of Legislature, derived the most benefit from the Public Information Officers' public relations efforts. In descending Legislature, as indicated in the responses, was an overwhelming majority receiving Legislature. The Legislative Leaders considered as most benefiting all three Legislature from districts not serviced by their own Legislative representative. The Leaders also felt that a newsworthy Legislature derived benefit from the second priority public relations activities. If a non-activist Legislature, may attempt to a Legislator who is less well able to perform his own constituency affairs through the media.

A few Legislative Leaders strongly made clear that their party personality did not rely upon the Public Information Officers the leaderness in communicating via the media. This was so for somewhat

reasons. As they perceived it, their leadership positions made the media dependent upon them, to a great extent, as spokesmen for one party or the other. In certain instances, the legislative leaders came from metropolitan areas served by full-time legislative reporters and did not feel any necessity to put out press releases in great quantities. A final reason for some was that they had administrative assistants who wrote releases or made radio tapes for them.[6]

Table 4.4

Legislators' Opinions as to the Legislator Benefitting the Most from the Caucus Staffs' Public Relations Efforts*

Type of Legislator	Number of times mentioned
Ambitious	2
Rural	3†
Freshman	2
Non-activist	1

*N = 7. The legislators were allowed to make more than one response.

†Rural referred to, as indicated by the legislators' responses, those areas not serviced by their own Capitol Press Corps reporter.

JUSTIFYING TAX SUPPORTED PUBLIC RELATIONS

The legislative leaders justified the tax supported public relations activities of the caucus staffs according to the responses

shown in Table 4.5. They emphasized the citizen education function demanded of democracy to insure an "informed electorate." One legislator stated:

> I see this [the caucus staff public relations activity] mainly as a means of educating the public about this layer of government which lies between federal and local government, educating them of the existence and activities that occur in state government.

Another legislator remarked that in a democracy making the people better informed was a useful public service. A third legislator related that helping to stimulate citizen interest in government through the provision of information about government was a good governmental policy. A fourth legislator said:

> The justification is that people ought to know. And this [the public relation activities] is a way they get to know. Whether or not the people want to know, that is their decision. But, they have a right to know.

Table 4.5

Legislators' Justification for Tax Support of Caucus Staff Public Relations Activities*

Justification	Number of times mentioned
Informing the public of state legislative government	4
The partisan reality of the legislative process	1
The peoples' right to know	1

*N = 6.

shown in Table 4.4. They represented the citizens elsewhere frequently desired to observe the issues in "informed discussion." The legislative statement

I am in favor of the general public relations activity, mainly as a means of educating the public about this legislature so government will take between informed and broad government educating them of the activities and activities that serve in these governments.

Another legislator commented that in a democracy making the people better informed was a useful public service. A third legislator related such budgets to educating citizens interested in government through the provision of information about government was a good governmental policy. A fourth legislator said:

The justification is that people ought to know. Our role (the public relations activities) is a very deep pit to know. Whether or not the people want to know, this is their activities. But, they have a right to know.

Table 4.4

Legislators' Justifications for the Support of Some Staff Public Relations Activities*

Justification	Number of times mentioned
Informing the public of state legislative government	1
The previous reality of the legislative process	1
The people's right to know	1

*N = 4.

The legislative leaders appeared convinced as to the validity of the communication function being performed in the legislators' behalf by the Public Information Officers and the caucus staffs. Moreover, they seemed satisfied that there was no irregularity in tax support financing the partisan oriented information activities of their caucus staffs.

The Partisanship Question

Information is power for those in government. Information policy becomes a tool for furthering political goals and administrative policy. The struggle over information as a power tool is a characteristic of the adversary relationship of the government and the press. That struggle over information policy as a power tool is also a characteristic of the battle waged for balance of power between the executive and legislative branches of government. In the Wisconsin Legislature, it appears that the provision of partisan staff support has enabled information to become a power tool for legislators. This is especially true since information is being disseminated along partisan lines.[7] Controversy has arisen over the question of public support financing partisan staffing support in the Wisconsin Legislature (see Chapter 3). However, the legislative leaders interviewed for this study saw advantages in a partisan information dissemination process; they simultaneously saw disadvantages in a non-partisan information dissemination arrangement.

Table 4.6 gives the legislators' opinions as to the advantages of a partisan arrangement. The disadvantages, as they saw them, of a

The legislative leaders focused exclusively on the activity of the Commission (which later provided to the Legislature) based on the Public Information Officer and his media clients. However, they framed legislative time, which was so thoroughly to support financing the partisan oriented information activities of state elected officials.

The Participatory Question

Information is power for those in government. Information policy focuses a tool for increasing political goals and administrative policy. The struggle over information is a power tool in a democratic state of the adversary relationship of the government and the press. This struggle over information policy is a power tool in such a distribution of the public's regard for balance of power between the executive and legislative branches of government. In the Commonwealth Legislature, it appears that the production of partisan stuff requires the medium information to become a power tool for legislators. This is especially true when state information is being disseminated along partisan lines.[7] Controversy has arisen over the question of public support financing partisan activities support in the Commonwealth Legislature (see Chapter 3). However, the legislative leaders interviewed for this study see advantages in a partisan information dissemination process. Their ambivalentcy are disadvantages in a nonpartisan information dissemination arrangement.

Table 4.6 gives the legislative opinions as to the advantages of a partisan arrangement. The disadvantages, as they see them, of a

non-partisan arrangement are shown in Table 4.7. The legislators, like their information officers, considered the partisan arrangement of the legislative public relations efforts to be better than a non-partisan arrangement. The most often mentioned reason for this was that legislators could feel more confident in expressing their views through a partisan setup since the staff help would be sympathetic to the legislator's political position. The legislative leaders believed a non-partisan public relations activity would do away with some of the partisan reality of the legislative process. Moreover, they felt that a legislator might be hesitant in working with a non-partisan agency since he could not assure himself of the trustworthiness of those employed there. If the information officer is allied along partisan lines with the legislators he serves, according to the respondents, it should evoke a franker exchange between the two parties.

Because of the partisan organization and partisan role of the caucus staffs the legislative leaders specified that the Public Information Officer's loyalty was quite important in the performance of his duties for caucus members. Loyalty was insured through hiring practices. As one legislator stated in regard to the importance of the information officer's loyalty, "to do a good job he has to think in a partisan fashion."

Table 4.6

Legislators' Opinions as to the Advantages of a Partisan Public Relations Function*

Advantages	Number of times mentioned
Allows aggressive reporting by caucus staff	1
Follows partisan nature of the legislature itself	1
Allows legislators to be more confident in presenting their views	3
Allows interest of participants to be a motivational factor	1
Forces media to be wary of biased reporting on its part	1

*N = 7. Legislators were allowed to make more than one response

Table 4.7

Legislators' Opinions as to the Disadvantages of a Non-partisan Public Relations Function*

Disadvantages	Number of times mentioned
Questionable loyalty	2
Lack of zeal on part of information personnel	1
Lack of freedom for legislator in expressing his views	1
Information dissemination would become a mass production affair	1

*N = 5.

Table 1.6

Legislators' opinions as to the advantages of a Montana Public Education Foundation*

Advantages	Number of times mentioned
Gives supplemental responsibility to regional units	1
Relieves penalties accruing to the legislators itself	1
Allows legislators to be seen as benefactors to protecting public funds	1
Allows increases of participants to be a motivational factor	1
Person needs to be only at interest investing on his part	1

*N = 7. Legislators were allowed to make more than one response

Table 1.7

Legislators' opinions as to the disadvantages of a Comprehensive Public Education Foundation*

Disadvantages	Number of times mentioned
Constitutional invalid	2
Lack of need on part of information personnel	1
Lack of freedom for legislature in supervising his funds	1
Information dissemination would become a main problem affair	1

*N = 5.

EFFECTS OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITY

All the legislative leaders interviewed believed that the information officers, by their efforts, had increased the flow of legislative news to the people through the media (see Table 4.8). One legislator commented that, based on personal observation, that an increase had been brought about.

> I've noticed a substantial increase of results of that effort by increased news items appearing in newspapers, increased comments, quotations and even actual tapes over radio and television. It [the public relations material] must have value. While perhaps the news media does not use all of it, they certainly are using a good share of it.

The legislators also considered the caucus staff-originated public relations activities to be making a contribution to the state's public information system (see Table 4.9). That system, as defined in Chapter 3, is the informational system by which a person learns of the activity of his state government. One legislative leader commented that the contribution to that system made by the information activities is "educating people on government" by making material available to the people. Another related the contribution was a "balanced presentation of the partisan positions."

Although the legislators conceded that the information officers by their activities made a contribution of note, they did not feel that the information officers were essential in the transmission of information on the legislature and its members to the public through the media. One legislator rejoined that while he felt the information officer himself was not essential, the function the information officer

Effects of the Public Relations Activity

All the legislative leaders interviewed believed that the information officers, by their efforts, had increased the flow of legislative news to the people through the media (see Table 4.4). One legislator commented that, based on personal observations, that an increase had been brought about.

> I've noticed a substantial increase of media of your actions by interested news items appearing in newspapers, interested economic, conservation and other actual issues over radio and television. It [the public relations activity] must have been value, while perhaps the news media does not use all of it, they certainly are making a good share of it.

The legislators also considered the secondary self-evaluated public relations activities to be making a contribution to the state's public information system (see Table 4.5). Their opinion, as defined in Chapter 3, is the informational system by which a person learns of the activity of his state government. The legislative leader commented that the contribution to that system made by the information activities is "educating people as government, by making material available to the people. Another related the contribution was a "balanced presentation of the problems problems."

Although the legislators concluded that the information officers by their activities made a contribution of note, they did not feel that the information officers were essential in the transmission of information on the legislature and its members to the public through the media. One legislator replied that media is full the information officer himself was not essential, the function the information officer

Table 4.8

Legislators' Opinions as to the Effect of the Public Information Officer's Public Relations Activities Upon the Legislative News Flow

Responses	Number mentioning (N = 7)
Increased flow	7
Decreased flow	0
No effect upon flow	0
Total	7

Table 4.9

Legislators' Opinions as to Whether the Activities Make a Contribution to the State's Public Information System

Responses	Number responding (N = 6)
Yes	6
No	0
Depends	0
Total	6

performed was. Most of the respondents felt that legislators could perform their own communication tasks themselves if forced to as they had in the past. However, the availability of the information officer freed legislators to pursue activities other than writing press releases or making tapes for radio stations. The two legislators stating that the information officer was essential argued that the legislator "lacked time" to perform such activities.

The legislative leaders interviewed unanimously agreed that the Public Information Officer was an effective channel for the legislator who desired to communicate with constituents via the media (see Table 4.10). One legislator feared that there was a danger that the Public Information Officer could be overly effective in his communication activities. As the legislator saw it, the information officer, by carrying out his activities to an extreme could create a "false image" of a legislator, making him seem more knowledgeable than he really was and thereby "spoof" the public by giving them an inaccurate picture of the legislator.

Table 4.10

Legislators' Opinions as to Whether the PIO is an Effective Channel for a Legislator Desiring to Communicate Via the Media

Responses	Number responding (N = 7)
Yes	7
No	0
Depends	0
Total	7

participant was. Most of the respondents felt that a legislative media position taker was considerable value functioning if things is an long-run but in the part. However, the productivity of the information officer from legislators is proven activities other than providing press releases or making tapes for radio stations. The top legislators stating that the information officer was essential support and the legislator "looking time" to perform such activities.

The legislators looking backward questionnaire, showed that the Public Information Officer was in effective position for the legislators who desired to communicate with constituents via the media (see Table 5.10). The legislators feared that there was a danger that the Public Information Officer would be merely effective in the communication activities. In the legislator met it, the information officer, by carrying out his activities in an effective could create a "false image" of a legislator, making his seem more knowledgeable than he really was and thereby regard the position by giving them an innovative picture of the legislator.

Table 5.10

Legislators' opinions as to whether the PIO is an effective channel for a legislator seeking to communicate via the media

Response	Number responding (N = 5)
Yes	4
No	0
Depends	0
Total	4

As the legislative leaders viewed the situation, they believed that the skills of the Public Information Officer were valuable to a legislator who desired to put those skills to work for himself in his legislative role.

The Legislators and the Press

Dunn's study of the "Interaction Between The Press and Wisconsin State Officials" examined in detail how legislative leaders both viewed and used the press in their jobs as legislators.[8] Dunn stated:

> The most salient function of the press in the view of the public official is serving as a mechanism of linkage between decision makers and private groups and individuals. The linkage mechanism is a two-way communication channel which transmits from the public official to the people and from the people to public officials.[9]

Dunn found that legislators, as well as other public officials viewed the function of the press to be basically that of "informer."[10] The press served to inform the public and assist the official in informing the public, as viewed by the officials interviewed for his study. Dunn found officials to attribute other functions to the press but the press's role as "informer" was the one most often mentioned by his respondents.

Four legislative leaders included in this study stated the press's function in covering state legislative activity was to inform the people of government's actions.[11] Table 4.11 shows the rating given the press coverage of the Wisconsin Legislature by the legislative leaders. No legislator rated that press coverage in a negative manner. But, the legislative leaders, much like their Public

As the legislative leader planned his activities, they believed that the activity of the chief executive officer was reliable in a legislature who desired to get some action to work for himself in the legislative role.

The Legislature and the Press

Dunn's study of the relationship between the press and Florida State Officials[8] revealed to detail how legislative leaders both viewed and used the press in their jobs as legislators.[9] Dunn stated:

> The most evident function of the press in the view of the public officials is serving as a mechanism of linkage between decision makers and private groups and individuals. The linkage mechanism is a two-way communication channel which transmits from the public officials to the people and from the people to public officials.[10]

Dunn found that legislators, as well as other public officials viewed the function of the press to be basically news or information.[11] The press served to inform the public and assist the officials in informing the public, as viewed by the officials interviewed for his study. Dunn found officials to emphasize other functions to the press but the press's role as "watchdog" was the one most often mentioned by the respondents.

Four legislative leaders interviewed in this study felt the press's function is covering press legislative activity and to inform the people of government's actions.[12] Table 1.1 shows the rating given the press coverage of the different organizations by the legislative leaders. Six legislators rated that press coverage is a negative issue. But, the legislative leaders, such like other media

Information Officers, cited some press deficiencies which they thought noteworthy. One legislator referred to the superficiality of legislative news coverage by the media. He specifically mentioned that there was not enough "digging in" done by legislative reporters. There was, as he observed, a lack of "in depth" reporting by the media on legislative activity. The legislator attributed that lack to the limitations of space and time placed upon a reporter by his media organization. Three legislators referred to the biases of specific media organizations as a deficiency observable in media coverage of state legislative activity.

Table 4.11

Legislators' Ratings of the Press Coverage of the Wisconsin Legislature

	Excellent	Pretty good	Good	Average	Total
Number responding (N = 7)	3	1	1	2	7

Table 4.12 summarizes the problems which the legislative leaders thought confronted state legislative reporters in their attempts to cover state legislative news. The responses followed closely those of the Public Information Officers discussed in Chapter 3. However, the legislative leaders added an area not previously mentioned as a problem confronting reporters. That area was secrecy. The press argues that the closed door deliberations of the four caucuses which are not open to reporters and uninvited guests should

information officers, stated some press deficiencies which they thought necessary. The legislator referred to the importance of legislative news coverage by the media. No specifically mentioned laws were not such except "digging out" done by legislative reporters. There was, as he observed, a lack of "in depth" reporting by the media on legislative activity. The legislature architected over land to the institutions of women and then proceed upon a reporter by his media organizations. There legislators referred to the lessons of specific media reportedations as a deficiency observable in media coverage of state legislature activity.

Table 5.11

Legislators' opinions of the Press Coverage
of the Alabama Legislature

	Conclusive	Fairly good	Good	Average	Total
Radio reporting (N = 7)	3	1	1	2	7

Table 5.11 shows that the political which the legislative liaison thought conformed state legislature reporters in their coverage to serve media legislative needs. The response indicated always close of the Radio information officers summed to eleven 3. However, the legislative liaison added to area not previously mentioned as a problem conforming reporters. That area was average. The press argues that the closed door deliberations of the legislature which are not open to reporters and authorized journals should

be done away with. The legislators conceded that those "closed caucuses" might hinder a reporter in covering state legislative activity. But, as will be shown in the next chapter, legislative reporters work around the "closed caucuses" problem by utilizing their own "intelligence" networks and their personal newsgathering techniques. Reporters seem to have little trouble discovering what goes on in the closed caucuses. Someone normally emerges mad and will talk to reporters in private. Yet, the press continually derides the idea and practice of "secret meetings" in the legislature.

Table 4.12

Legislators' Opinions of Problems Confronting State Legislative Reporters*

Problems	Number of times mentioned
Volume and complexity of activity to be covered	3
Lack of time	3
Bias of paper	1
Secrecy of closed caucuses and unofficial meetings	4
Turnover rate of legislative reporters	1

*N = 6. Legislators were allowed to make more than one response.

be done only with. The legislatures considered have shown "mixed assessment" which hinder a response in executing state legislative activity. Thus, as will be shown in the next chapter, legislative responses work around the "mixed assessment" problem by establishing their "intelligence" networks and their personal investigative networks. Reporters seem to have little trouble determining what goes on in the school management. However personally assigns not and will talk to reporters in private. Yet, the press consistently decides the time and priorities of "secret meetings" in the legislature.

TABLE 3.19

Legislators' Opinions of Problems Interfering With Legislative Reporters*

Problems	Number of times mentioned
Volume and complexity of activity to be covered	7
Lack of time	7
Size of paper	2
Secrecy of closed committee and unofficial meetings	6
Turnover rate of legislative reporters	2

*N = 6. Legislators were allowed to make more than one response.

All seven legislators interviewed unanimously agreed that the creation of the Public Information Officer position had not affected the relationship of reporters and legislators (see Table 4.13). The legislative leaders did not consider the Public Information Officer to be a buffer between themselves and the press. Moreover, the legislators interviewed did not envision the information officers as funnels through which the legislator's news contacts and activities were supposed to flow. As they pictured it, the Public Information Officer was a staff assistant and not a personal spokesman for each of them. One legislator described the information officer's post thusly:

> I think any reporter can contact any legislator just as easy now as he could before. I do not feel that the Public Information Officer issuing releases on occasion has increased or decreased reporter-legislator contacts. If a reporter wants to talk to the leadership or anyone else in the legislature he can do so. He doesn't have to talk to the Public Information Officer. This isn't like a President's Press Secretary where he gets out and speaks for the President. Our Public Information Officers have no right to speak for us on matters of policy. If he started doing it he would be reprimanded.

Legislators have a stake in their public expressions and they want to be their own spokesmen for reasons of necessity related to the nature of their elective positions. Besides, as one legislator offered, if there was an initial resentment of the information officers by the reporters, reporters soon found that their newsgathering habits had not been affected in any visible way by the Public Information Officers. Dunn described the importance of legislator accessibility in his study as related to the legislators' value as a news source

All seven legislators interviewed unanimously agreed that the evaluation of the Public Information officer position had not affected the relationship of reporters and legislators (see table 1.23). The legislative leaders did not consider the media officer to be a buffer between themselves and the press. Secondly, the legislators interviewed did not invite the information officers to consult surveys which the legislator's aides conducted and activities were supposed to fill. In this situation 1), the Public Information officer was a mere assistant and not a personal spokesman for each of them. The legislators overlook the information officer's good loyalty.

> I think my reporter-aide assisted my legislator just as well as he could before. I do not feel that the Public Information officer having relatives or connection has increased or decreased reporter-legislator contacts. If a reporter wants to talk to the legislator or express ideas to the legislators he can do so. He doesn't have to talk to the Public Information officer. This isn't like a President's Press Secretary where he gets out and speaks for the President. The Public Information officers have no right to speak for us on matters of policy. If he received doing it he would be reprimanded.

Legislators have a stake in their public appearances and they want to be right and consistent for reasons of personally related to the nature of their elective positions. Besides, as one legislator stated, if there was an initial resentment of the information officers by the reporters, reporters soon found that their investigating habits had not been affected in any visible way by the Public Information officers. Then described the importance of legislator accountability in his study as related to the legislators' value as a news source

for reporters.[12] It appears that legislator accessibility has not been materially changed by the creation of the Public Information Officer positions.

Table 4.13

Legislators' Opinions as to Whether the PIO Position Had Affected the Relationship of Reporter and Legislator

Responses	Number responding (N = 7)
Yes	0
No	7
Total	7

The concept of a "legislative image" was discussed by the legislative leaders. Like their information officers, the legislators thought that image was generally a bad image. A few legislators indicated that the communication efforts of the Public Information Officers might effect a change in that image over a period of time. Those legislators perceived the information officer as assisting individual legislators in becoming "high profile" legislators. They felt that that increased visibility might be changing the public's image of legislators and hence changing the image of the legislature in general. One legislator thought the case for changing the nature of the legislative image might be a lost cause because he considered legislators in a class with "umpires, referees, and mothers-in-law," which are constant targets of derision.

for reporters.[15] In response each legislator concentrated one particular committee assigned by the members of the Public Information Officers politics.

Table 1.11

Legislators' opinions as to whether the Public Relations Officer activities the relationship of Reporter and Legislator

Response	Number responded (N = 7)
Yes	6
No	1
Total	7

The image of a "Legislative Leader" was discussed by the Legislative Leaders. Like State Information officers, the Legislators thought that image was generally a bad image. A few Legislators indicated that the communication efforts of the Public Information officers might effect a change in that image over a period of time. Those Legislators perceived the Information officers as assisting individual Legislators in becoming "high profile" Legislators. They felt that their increased visibility might be changing the public's image of Legislators and hence changing the image of the Legislature in general. One Legislator thought the case for changing the image of the Legislative image might be a lost cause because he perceived Legislators in a class with "reporters, relatives, and mother-in-law," which are constant targets of derision.

LEGISLATOR USE OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS SERVICES

Table 4.14 accounts legislator utilization of various communication dissemination techniques by a total of ninety-nine legislators from both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature (total number of legislators in the legislature is one hundred and thirty-three). A one page anonymous questionnaire distributed to all legislators during the legislative session in September, 1971 was used to gather the data for the table. The response rate was seventy-four percent. The table discloses that a majority of legislators utilized press releases, periodic personal newspaper columns, and radio tapes to disseminate communication from themselves to the public. Those activities are activities performed by the Public Information Officers and other caucus staff personnel as shown in Chapter 3 of this study.

Table 4.15 depicts where the legislators turned for assistance in carrying out their communication efforts. The table relates that for press releases, radio tapes, and personal newspaper columns legislators turned to the caucus staff (which includes the Public Information Officer) or to some combination of helpers including the caucus staff for assistance.

The average number of media outlets to which legislators utilizing each communication dissemination technique forwarded such material is given in Table 4.16.

The three tables (Table 4.14; Table 4.15; and, Table 4.16) confirm that the capabilities of the caucus staffs in the public

INFLUENCES THAT AFFECT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

Table 4.11 accounts legislator assessment of various communication dissemination techniques by a total of nineteen legislators from both houses of the Minnesota Legislature (total number of legislators in the Legislature is one hundred and thirty-three). I was pleasantness questionnaire distributed to all legislators during the legislative session in September, 1971 and used to create the data for table. The response rate was seventy-four percent. The table discloses that a majority of legislators utilized press releases, periodic personal newspaper columns, and radio talks to disseminate communication from themselves to the public. These activities are activities performed by the public information officers and other session staff personnel as known to Congress 2 or 3 times along.

Table 4.12 depicts where the legislators turned for assistance in carrying out their communication efforts. The table reflects that for press releases, radio talks, and personal newspaper columns legislators turned to the session staff (which includes the Public Information Officer) or to some combination of legislative institutions session staff for assistance.

The average number of media outlets to which legislators utilized each communication dissemination technique furnished and material is given in table 4.13.

The three tables (Table 4.11, Table 4.12 and, Table 4.13) depicts that the capabilities of the session staffs to the public

relations area are being exploited by a majority of Wisconsin legislators. In the next chapter, the public relations function and activities will be analyzed from the perspective of the working Capitol reporter. The reporters provide the final analysis in this three-part analysis of the legislative public relations in Wisconsin.

relations area are being applied to a variety of Florida legislators. In the past chapter, the public relations theories and activities will be analyzed from the perspective of the working legislat regarded. The researcher provide the final analysis in this three-part analysis of the legislative public relations in Tallahassee.

Table 4.14

Legislator Use of Information Dissemination Techniques*

Technique	Don't use	Use daily	Use weekly	Use monthly	Few times a year	Total
Press releases	9	2	50	22	16	99
Periodic personal newspaper column	37	0	25	11	26	99
Radio "Beepers" (tapes)	20	1	37	17	24	99
Periodic personal radio show	55	0	6	16	22	99
Constituent newsletter	55	0	4	16	24	99
TV tapes	88	0	1	1	9	99
Periodic personal TV show	80	0	0	5	14	99
Press conferences	73	0	0	5	21	99

*N = 99. There are one hundred and thirty-three legislators in the Wisconsin Legislature. There are one hundred Representatives in the Assembly and thirty-three Senators in the Senate.

Table 4.11

Legislator Use of Information
Dissemination Technique*

Technique	Don't use	Use daily	Use weekly	Use monthly	Use less often than once a year	Total
Press releases	4	2	50	42	12	57
Periodic personal newspaper column	37	0	25	11	24	57
Radio "Newsreel" (Live)	40	1	27	17	21	56
Periodic personal radio show	54	0	6	16	20	57
Constituent newsletter	52	0	5	16	18	57
TV taped	55	0	1	1	7	57
Periodic personal TV show	50	0	0	0	12	57
Press conferences	23	0	0	7	27	57

*N = 57. These are one hundred and thirty-three legislators in the Connecticut Legislature. There are one hundred Representatives in the Assembly and thirty-three Senators in the Senate.

Table 4.15

Groups or Individuals Supplying Legislators with Assistance in Communication Activities*

Activities	Self	Admin. Ass't†	Sec'y‡	Caucus staff	Other*
Press releases	14	3	10	30	31
Periodic personal newspaper column	23	4	5	18	16
Radio "Beepers" (tapes)	21	0	8	31	24
Periodic personal radio show	41	2	1	6	6
Constituent newsletter	23	6	0	8	11
TV tapes	30	0	0	2	1
Periodic personal TV show	37	0	0	0	2
Press conferences	32	0	0	3	8

*N = those stating they used the particular communication activity in Table 4.14. Not all respondents indicated where they turned for assistance so totals of Table 4.14 and Table 4.15 do not correlate exactly.

†Admin. Ass't = Administrative Assistant.

‡Sec'y = Secretary.

*Other = Any combination of the other categories and the caucus staff.

TABLE 4.12

DEGREE OF INTERVALLY SUPPLYING DEPARTMENTS WITH
ASSISTANCE IN COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES*

ACTIVITIES	ALT	ADMIN.† SEC'Y	SEC'Y‡	DIRECT. WORK	OTHER§
Phone calls	15	3	11	14	12
Personal contacts	63	4	5	16	10
Audio dictaphone (typed)	21	0	8	20	51
Provide personal radio show	12	2	1	6	2
Conferences, committees	23	6	3	8	11
TV taping	20	0	0	8	3
Provide personal TV show	37	2	0	0	1
Typed correspondence	32	3	0	2	2

*N = 3 times stating that each the particular communication activity in Table 4.11. See all responses tabulated when they turned for departments on tables of Table 4.11 and Table 4.12 on the following page.

†Admin. Sec'y = Administrative Secretary.

‡Sec'y = Secretary.

§Other = Any combination of the other categories and the other staff.

Table 4.16

Average Number of Media Outlets to Which Legislators Using an Information Dissemination Technique Forwarded Such Material

Technique	Number of legislators using	Average number of media outlets sent material
Press releases	90	13.4
Periodic personal newspaper column	62	5.7
Radio "Beepers" (tapes)	79	5
Periodic personal radio show	44	2.2
TV tapes	11	2
Periodic personal TV show	19	1.4

Table 4.14

Average Number of Media Contacts in Each Legislative Body in Informating Dissemination Technique Promoted But Ignored

Technique	Number of legislators using	Average number of media contacts each executive
Press releases	90	14.4
Periodic personal newspaper column	52	5.7
Daily "Dispatch" (signal)	78	7
Periodic personal radio show	14	4.7
TV signal	11	3
Periodic personal TV show	17	1.4

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 4

[1] V. O. Key, Jr., Public Opinion And American Democracy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), p. 413.

[2] William A. Robson, The Governors and the Governed (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964), p. 36.

[3] American Institute For Political Communication, The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship (Washington, D.C.: American Institute For Political Communication, 1966), p. 28.

[4] Stanley Kelley, Jr., Professional Public Relations And Political Power (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), p. 3.

[5] Douglass Cater, The Fourth Branch Of Government (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), p. 47.

[6] One legislative leader stated that his own administrative assistant was a former newsman. See articles in both The Milwaukee Journal, July 7, 1971 and The Capital Times /Madison/, July 8, 1971, p. 1, cols. 1-4, for an overview of the growth of the administrative assistant position in the Wisconsin Legislature.

[7] Dr. Alan Rosenthal, in his study of "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," (manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Robison), p. 46, found that "partisan staff, in strengthening party leadership in caucus, inevitably increased the salience of party as a reference group in the legislature. It helped to increase cohesion within the parties and the conflict between the parties." Besides, the partisan staffing, according to Rosenthal, enhanced the legislature's ability to exert influence upon the executive branch of Wisconsin government. The caucus staffs' communication activities were a factor which aided in bringing about that ability, on the part of the legislature, to influence the executive branch.

[8] See Delmer Delano Dunn's, "Interaction Between The Press And Wisconsin State Officials" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967), Chapters V, VI, and VII.

[9] Ibid., p. 213.

[10] Ibid., p. 214.

[11] Not all legislators were asked this question.

[12] Dunn, "Interaction Between The Press And Wisconsin State Officials," p. 166.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 4

[1] G. Ray, Jr., *Public Opinion and American Democracy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), p. 62.

[2] William A. Robson, *The Government and the Governed* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964), p. 30.

[3] American Institute for Political Communication, *The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship* (Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Political Communication, 1960), p. 84.

[4] Stanley Kelley, Jr., *Professional Public Relations and Political Power* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), p. 1.

[5] Douglass Cater, *The Fourth Branch of Government* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), p. 67.

[6] One legislative leader stated that his son moonlighting contracted out a Texas company. See articles in both the *Milwaukee Journal*, July 1, 1971 and *The Capital Times* (Madison), July 6, 1971, p. 6, cols. 1-4, for an overview of the growth of the moonlighting controversy pertinent to the Wisconsin legislature.

[7] Mr. Alan Rosenthal, in his study of "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," (unpublished paper for the Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change, edited by James Robison), p. 16, found that "previous staff, in strengthening policy leadership in general, increased the reliance of party on a reference group in the legislature. It helped to increase cohesion within the parties and the conflict between the parties." Besides, the partisan staffing, according to Rosenthal, enhanced the legislature's ability to exert influence upon the executive branch of Wisconsin government. The caucus staffs' communication activities were a factor which aided in bridging elect-ral ability, on the part of the legislature, to influence the executive branch.

[8] See Delmer Nelson Dunn's, "Interactions Between the Press and Wisconsin State Officials" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967), Chapters V, VI, and VII.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[11] But all legislators were asked this question.

[12] Dunn, "Interactions Between The Press and Wisconsin State Officials," p. 146.

Chapter 5

THE CAPITOL PRESS CORPS REPORTERS VIEW THE LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC RELATIONS FUNCTION

This chapter presents the concluding segment of a three-part analysis of the Wisconsin Legislature's emerging public relations function. This chapter, specifically, is an analysis of that function from the perspective of sixteen news reporters who are assigned by their media to cover legislative activity (see Table 1.1 for a list of the media represented by those sixteen reporters). The reporters, representing both print and electronic media, supply an extra-governmental view of the public relations activities of the legislature's caucus staffs. Moreover, as individuals deeply involved in the legislative news process, the reporters offer a knowledgeable assessment of the impact of the public relations activities upon the traditional flow of legislative news.

News reporters witness events which are not usually accessible to other persons for various reasons. Reporters supply, in most cases, a person's daily "intelligence" of the events occurring throughout the world. The Capitol Press Corps reporters who cover the daily activity of Wisconsin's Legislature witness and transmit, via their media organizations to the subscribers of their organizations, "intelligence" about the day's legislative activity. The reporter's task of gathering and disseminating the day's legislative "intelligence"

Chapter 5

THE CAPITOL PRESS CORPS PERCEIVED VIA THE LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROCESS

This chapter presents the concluding component of a triangulated analysis of the Tennessee Legislature's executive public relations function. This chapter, specifically, is an analysis of the reaction from the perspective of statehouse news reporters who are confronted by their media to cover legislative activity. Lane Table 1.1 for a link of the media representatives to state statehouse reporters. In-depth, experienced, non-print and electronic media, reflect on the governmental side of the public relations activities of the legislature's studied staff. Moreover, as interpretations depict behavior in the legislative news process, the reporters offer a journalistic assessment of the impact of the public relations activities upon the institutional flow of legislatory news.

Some reporters witness events which are not usually perceived to occur perhaps twice. Reporters report, in one sense, a person's daily "highlights" of the events occurring throughout the world. The Capitol Press Corps reconstructs the entire the daily activity of Tennessee's legislative actions and personnel, via their media representations to the subscribers of their organizations, "highlights" about the day's legislative activity. The reporter's task of gathering and disseminating the day's legislative "highlights"

or "news" brings him, quite often, into daily contact with legislators. The interaction of reporter and legislator is a significant part of the reporter's newsgathering task.

Reporters and legislators interact within the overall context of an "adversary relationship." William Rivers described that relationship in "Appraising Press Coverage of Politics."

> Clearly, the founders considered informing the people to be a function of democracy. But they carefully refrained from setting up an official information system. Instead, the informing function was turned over to the press. In effect, the press--privately owned, beyond official control--was incorporated into the machinery of democratic government.
>
> Surely, some of the genius of the American idea flows from the fact that the apparatus of information was made an independent part of the continuing government in a way that insured its freedom from any particular administration. Officials from the first have had to adopt to the anomaly of an information system that is of, but not in, the government. This established a natural struggle between the men of the press and the men of the official government.[1]

Government depends upon communication in its attempts to govern. But, as Rivers stated, government does not control the press. The press's position in American democracy, on the other hand, calls for the press to perform a "watchdog" function for the country's citizens and for the press to act as a "check" upon government in the citizens' behalf. The press is expected to ferret out and expose government activity to preclude government becoming a threat to the freedom of the nation's people. Yet, the relationship of press and government in America involves other ramifications in addition to those just cited. In America, government has always been news. Leo Rosten wrote in his classic The Washington Correspondents that: "Politics is news. Politicians are news."[2] "News" is a saleable

or "dumb" brings risk, quite often, into daily contact with legislators. The innovation of reporters and legislators is a significant part of the reporter's newsgathering task.

Reporters and legislators interact within the overall context of an "adversary relationship." William Rivers described this relationship in "Reporting From Capitols of Politics."

> Clearly, the Founders contemplated supplying the media with a function of democracy. But they carefully refrained from erecting an official information system. Instead, the informing function was turned over to the press. In effect, the press--particularly among Washington officials--was designated into the institutions of democratic government.
>
> Hardly, some of the period of the American Elite Press from the fact that the appearance of independence was made an independent part of the evolving government in a way that lodged the freedom from any particular administration. Officials from the first have had to adapt to the reality of an institutionalized press that is not, but is, the government. This relationship is marked struggle between the men of the press and the men of the official government.[4]

Government depends upon communication in its attempts to govern. But, as Rivers stated, government does not control the media. The press's position in American democracy, on the other hand, calls for the press to perform a "watchdog" function for the country's citizens and for the press to act as a "check" upon government in the citizens' behalf. The press is expected to force and keep government activity in periodic government knowledge a matter in the freedom of the nation's people. Yet, the relationship of press and government in America involves other restrictions in addition to these just cited. In America, government has always been open. Low barriers exist in the classic The Washington Correspondents that "Politics is news. Politicians are news."[5] "News" is a relationship

commodity which the press as a business institution seeks to market for its profit. So, as the American Institute For Political Communication stated:

> Government officials and newsmen are mutually dependent to an extent which makes it virtually impossible for either to function effectively over the long run without the cooperation of the other.[3]

David S. Broder wrote in an article published along with the Rivers' article cited earlier that the relationship of a politician or a public official and a reporter is not, nor ever can be, a neutral relationship. He stated:

> And the reason I would suggest to you why it cannot [be a neutral relationship] is that the process of news dissemination, as the politician would view it, is inextricably involved with the whole process and the competition for power that is at the very essence of the governing process.[4]

Broder further contended that the relationship of reporter and official or politician was colored by their goals. He wrote:

> There is a kind of built-in tension in the relationship. It is, if you will, essentially a manipulative relationship on both sides in which each party is attempting to use the other for his own purposes.[5]

Accordingly, Wisconsin's legislative reporters bring an "adversary" perspective to the rise of public relations activities within the state legislature. Since such activities are normally interpreted by the press as attempts to suppress the news and to "sell" the government to the people, the press often sees danger, and competition, in such activities. Therefore, the "adversary" perspective of the reporters may elicit insights and concerns which may not have been taken into account by either the Public Information

commenting which the press on a politician institution needs in making

for the profit. Thus, as the American Institute for Political Communication

stating stated:

> Government officials and leaders are socially dependent on
> an values which makes it virtually impossible for either to
> function effectively over the long run without the cooperation
> of the press.[1]

David S. Broder notes in his article published along with the

Drew[2] article cited earlier that the relationship of a politician

or a public official and a reporter is not, nor ever has been, a neutral

relationship. He stated:

> And the reason I would suggest to you why it cannot be
> neutral relationship is that the process of news dissemination
> in the politician world view is, in inevitably involves with
> the media process but the competition for power that is the
> very essence of the governing process.[3]

Broder further concluded that the relationship of reporters

and officials or politicians was colored by their roles. He stated:

> There is a kind of built-in tension in the relationship. It
> is, if you will, essentially a complicated relationship in both
> sides in using each party to attempt to use the other for its
> own purposes.

Interestingly, Wisconsin's legislative reporters bring an

"adversary" perspective to the role of public relations activities

within the state legislature. Since such activities are normally

interpreted by the press as attempts to suppress the news and to

"sell" the government to the people, the press often news leaders, and

competition, in such activities. Therefore, the "adversary" pe-

spective of the reporters may clash with legislative and executive which may

not have been taken into account by either the Public Information

Officers or the legislative leaders in their perceptions of the burgeoning legislative public relations function in Wisconsin.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS NECESSITY

Reporters and editors have often shown hostility to governmental public relations programs, moreover, they have repeatedly shown hostility to any government encroachment into the newsgathering and reporting process. Joseph H. Mader summarized the newspaper correspondent's supposed effects of government's funneling news through press sections in a 1942 Journalism Quarterly article. He wrote:

> Among the most vocal of these critics are newspaper correspondents themselves, whose foreboding pronouncements as to the likely effects of this system [government's funneling news through press sections] may be summarized as follows:
>
> It leads to the substitution of propaganda for news.
>
> It tends to reduce and impair independent reporting.
>
> It closes off hitherto open news sources; puts bureau chiefs and policy makers behind reporter-proof doors, and leaves only the press officer at the public wicket.
>
> Its effect often is to siphon away from the public prints all the dross, the inconvenient, the embarrassing, the unfavorable news.
>
> It often serves to clamp on a censorship instead of imparting information or intelligence.
>
> It is wasteful of money, labor and time--not to forget paper--on the production and in all the media through which it is hoped to reach the "consumer."
>
> The measure of success for the government information specialist too often is the number of times the name of his bureau chief or department has appeared favorably in the public press.
>
> It results in chaos and confusion in the reporting of public affairs, brought about by delays, contradictions, denials and statements as bureaucrats bicker and tangle . . . .[6]

Mader's summarization, although specifically concerned with the effects of "press sections" or "press bureaus," included many

efforts or the initiative lacking in their participation of the Democratic legislative public relations function in Minnesota.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS MOVEMENT

Democratic lay activism have often shown availability as general public relations programs, however, they have repeatedly shown hostility to any permanent activities like the development and reporting process. Joseph R. Brown criticized the management-entrepreneurial's apparent efforts of government's functioning been through press sections in a 1962 Presentation Democratic article. He wrote:

> Among the most vocal of these critics are newspaper columnists, whose functioning personnelmanship as to the likely effects of this system (Governmental functions been served press sections) may be summarized as follows:
>
> It leads to the substitution of propaganda for news.
>
> It leads to verbose and tedious informational reporting.
>
> It closes off minority opinion from government, pro forma study and policy, merely backed propaganda-proof doors, and leaves only the press officer at the public mission.
>
> Its effect varies in the eighteen-year from the public points all the news, the information, the entertaining, the informational news.
>
> It often serves to stamp an a controversy tendency of impartiality information or intelligence.
>
> It is wasteful of money, labor and time--not to forget paper--of the production and in all the media through which it is input to keep the business.
>
> The absence of process for the government information specialist has often is the member of which the name of the branch staff or department has appeared favorably in the public press.
>
> It results in claims and counterclaims in the reporting of public affairs, brought about by delays, misrepresentations, omissions and statements as inconsistent distort and simple . . . .

Mann's recommendation, strongly specifically concerned with the efforts of "press sections" or "press bureaus," included some

complaints which the press in general, levels at any government encroachment upon the "news" realm whether in the form of "press sections," "news management," or "public relations activities." Reporters tenaciously guard their "adversary" position in reporting news of government. They most often express a grave dislike for the government's efforts to direct their newsgathering efforts and for the government's actions in handing news to them in the form of handouts. And yet, in some cases, government's reporting of itself through press sections, Public Information Officers, and public relations activities directly assists the reporter in his reportorial tasks.

Table 5.1 portrays the responses of the reporters interviewed for this study as to whether they thought there was a need for press relations assistance for state legislators. The reporters were closely divided in their opinions. Two reporters indicated that they did not feel that all legislators required or should have such assistance. Their reasoning was that, as they saw it, not all legislators had something to say. The two reporters thought that providing such assistance for all legislators would innundate the Capitol reporter with written materials, and they already considered themselves taxed by more reading than they could handle. Two other reporters responded that such press relations assistance might be required by legislators, but, the Capitol Press Corps did not need any such assistance. The two reporters so responding claimed that they personally did not use the caucus staffs' Public Information

Officers in their newsgathering efforts and probably would not use such assistants if they were furnished to legislators. One reporter stated that such assistance was required by legislators, but, if there were "adequate media personnel" covering the state legislature that would not be the case. Another reporter related that such press relations assistance was necessary to improve communication of legislative activity. He thought that press relations assistance could ultimately assist the Capitol reporter by constantly reminding legislators of the problems confronting legislative reporters and by cutting down the number of useless press releases. If a press relations assistant did those things, the reporter believed that his own job might be made easier.

Table 5.1

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether There is a Need for Press Relations Assistance for State Legislators

Responses	Number responding (N = 16)
Yes	8
No	5
Depends	3
Total	16

When they were queried if there was a need for the caucus staff Public Information Officer and his public relations activities,

officers in their recommending activity and probably would not have such assistance if they were consulted on legislation. The supervisor stated that such assistance was required by legislators that, if there were resources available, legislators would be his users. Another supervisor indicated that such group consulting assistance was necessary to improve communication of legislative activity. He thought that group consultation assistance could ultimately insure the desired response to constituent concerns. Legislators of this problem constituted legislative requests and by auditing them for lacking of legislative policy references. Of course, relative availabilities did those things, the supervisor believed that his unit job might be much easier.

Table 7.1

Supervisors' Opinions as to Whether There Is a Need for Group Activities Assistance for State Legislators

Supervisor	Number responding (N = 12)
Yes	4
No	5
Depends	3
Total	12

Even they were capable of doing so, a need for the Legislative Audit Public Information Office and its public relations activities.

the reporters' responses divided almost evenly (see Table 5.2). Those reporters who answered that there was such a need thought that the need existed for the legislator and not for the reporter. On the other hand, those reporters who answered that there was no such need argued that there was "no need for me," and no need for such activities on behalf of all legislators.

Table 5.2

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether There is a Need for the Caucus Staff Public Information Officer

Responses	Number responding (N = 15)
Yes	7
No	8
Depends	0
Total	15

The Chief Target

Most of Wisconsin's legislative reporters claim that they have little to do with the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers and treat them as non-entities. The reporters do not generally view themselves as the main, or even as a major target, of the information officers' public relations activities. Eight of the sixteen reporters interviewed thought the chief target of the Public Information Officers' activities was the legislator's constituency. The eight

the reporters' responses varied almost equally (see Table 5.2). Three reporters who answered that there was some or a great amount also were asked for the legislator and not for the reporter. On the other hand, those reporters who answered that there was no or just some amount then there was reluctance for any of the two reporters to which of the legislators.

Table 5.2

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether There is a Need for the Bureau Staff Public Information Officer

Response	Number Responding (N = 12)
Yes	7
No	2
Depends	3
Total	12

The Other Target

Most of Nebraska's legislative reporters claim that they were likely to convey the general staff Public Information Officers any issue that are newsworthy. The reporters do not generally view themselves as the main, or even as a major target, of the informative officers' public relations activities. Either of the sixteen reporters interviewed thought the chief target of the Public Information Officers' activities was the legislature's constituency. The right

reporters believed that the legislators attempted to reach their constituents through dissemination of press releases and radio tapes to local radio stations and local weekly papers within their home districts. Seven other reporters, however, declared that different media outlets themselves were the "chief target" of the legislative public relations activities. Those seven reporters indicated that the legislative information officers aimed at the wire services and hometown weekly newspapers with their press releases. Moreover, those same reporters believed that the radio tapes produced by the caucus staffs, and the Public Information Officers, were directed at radio stations in the legislator's district. The views of the two groups of reporters closely approximated those of the legislative leaders, and of the Public Information Officers themselves. As both legislative leaders and their Public Information Officers stated, the chief target of the public relations activities was the voter or constituent. However, since the public relations activities of the information officers focused upon reaching many constituents at one time, the different public relations activities were targeted to the constituent through the constituent's news media outlets.

Legislators Benefitting the Most

Table 5.3 lists the reporters' beliefs as to which legislator gained the most benefit from the caucus staff public relations activities. One noteworthy difference among the responses by legislative leaders, Public Information Officers, and the legislative reporters was that legislative reporters (five of them) thought that

legislators holding leadership positions benefitted most from the information officer's public relations activities. However, a few legislative leaders, as cited in Chapter 4, said that they did not rely upon the caucus staff Public Information Officer, nor did they utilize his public relations services, mainly because of their leadership positions. The legislative leaders found that the reporters and press came to them often looking for a "spokesman" for their party. One legislative reporter touched upon that point in his response to the question.

> The leader who is quoted often in the press doesn't really need any press releases going back home because of the constant exposure of the daily newspapers. And, I think that is more effective in letting people know he is doing his job than a canned statement would be.

Table 5.3

Reporters' Opinions as to the Legislator Benefitting the Most from the Caucus Staff's Public Relations Efforts

Type of legislator	Number of times mentioned
Ambitious	*
Activist	5
Freshman	*
Non-Activist	1
Leadership	5
Varies	5

*These two types were mentioned along with rural, and urban legislators in combinations expressed by respondents categorized in the "Varies" response.

Legislators backed businessmen's positions unequivocally some from the Industrialists officer's public relations activities. However, a few legislators believed, as stated in Question 4, said that they did not rely upon the common sense of Public Information officers, but did have utilize the public relations services, mainly because of lack of knowledge positions. The legislative leaders found that the bureaucrats and power seem to have often changing for a "spokesman" for their party, the legislative reporter contacted upon some point in all responses to the questions.

The leader who is quoted often in the press should be a well-known reported giving their view because of the constant expansion of the daily newspapers. Also, I think that is more effective in letting people know he is doing his job than a canned statement would be.

Table 5.1

Reporters' opinions as to the legislator functioning the most from the Income Health's Public Relations Officers

Type of legislator	Number of times mentioned
Initiator	[illegible]
Leader	[illegible]
Freshman	[illegible]
Non-initiator	[illegible]
Leadership	[illegible]
Trying	[illegible]

*These the types were mentioned along with areas, and areas legislators in committees appointed by responsible categorized in the "Other" category.

Basically, the three groups interviewed in this study believed that a legislator could benefit from the public relations services, available through the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers, if he knew of those capabilities and sought to use them for himself.

JUSTIFYING TAX SUPPORTED PUBLIC RELATIONS

Possibly because of the nature of their "adversary" role in relation to government, and possibly because of their "adversary" role to any governmental encroachment upon the newsgathering process, five of the reporters interviewed believed that there was no justification for the expenditure of tax money in support of the caucuses' partisan public relations activities (see Table 5.4). But, an almost equal number of reporters thought that there was justification for such support. Those who thought so stated that the justification was in terms of "informing the people" of governmental activity.

Table 5.4

Reporters' Justification for Tax Support of Caucus Staff Public Relations Activities*

Justification	Number of times mentioned
Informing the public of state legislative government	6
No justification	5
Benefit to legislator	3
Conflict of executive and legislative branch of government in public relations area	1
Don't know	1

*N = 16.

Basically, the three groups interviewed in this study indicated that a legislator would benefit from his visible relations during available hours, the senior faculty would be individual citizens, or to some of those expectations and hopes on the part of the public.

INSTITUTE TAX CONTROLLED PUBLIC RELATIONS

Publicity-seeking of the labors of state "economy" role is minimized by government, and publicity seekers of state "economy" role by the governmental environment. Use the organizational process time of the respondents interviewed indicated that there was no publicity-seeking role the expectations of the people in support of the individual personal public relations activities (see Table 3.1). But, an almost equal number of respondents stated that there was publicity-seeking with support. There was another no answer that the publicity-seeking was in terms of "informing the public of government activity.

Table 3.1

Reporters' Institutions Are The Support of Jobs Most Public Relations Activities

Institutions	Number of times mentioned
Informing the public of state legislative government	6
To Institutions	3
Benefit to legislator	1
Publicity of committees and legislature	
Branch of government in public relations area	2
Don't know	2

N = 10.

One reporter who claimed that there was justification for tax support of such partisan information dissemination activities stated that:

> It is the duty of the legislator to keep in contact with his constituents . . . . His constituents have the right to be well informed about his positions and decisions and I think it is up to the state to foot the bill.

Another reporter who also believed that there was a justification for tax support backing the partisan public relations activities remarked:

> But, again, I think I've acknowledged that they may indeed serve a function of at least keeping people aware that there is a state legislature and that it is considering certain issues. And, people might not otherwise be aware of this, or would be aware of it only infrequently, maybe after action on issues.

One reporter who believed that there was no justification for tax support enabling the performance of such partisan oriented public relations activities answered that:

> I think, if they are going to have this sort of thing, that the parties should pay for it since they [the tax supported caucus staff public relations activities] are used almost exclusively for partisan purposes.

A fourth legislative reporter, who for some time had witnessed the growth of the caucus staffs, noted, after he answered that there was no justification for use of tax money to support partisan public relations by the caucus staffs, that:

> The really ironic thing is that these guys [the legislators] launched this big PR investigation of the agencies [state agencies] while they were beefing up their own [public relations staff] in the legislature.

EFFECTS OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITY

Wisconsin's legislative reporters believe, as do the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers and the legislative leaders who were previously cited in this study, that the public relations activities of the caucus staffs have increased the flow of legislative news from the legislature to the public through the media (see Table 5.5). The reporters thought this was especially true for those segments of the public which depended upon the weekly newspapers and/or local radio stations for their news of legislative activity.

The reporters also believed (see Table 5.6) that the Public Information Officers, because of their media experience and their knowledge of how the various media systems operated, were effective channels for the legislator who sought to communicate with the public via the media. Tables 5.5 and 5.6 correlate. One reason that the information officers have been able to increase the flow of legislative news would appear to be their expertise in the mass communication field. And, if the legislative Public Information Officers have increased the flow of legislative news they might naturally be considered as effective channels for the legislator who desired to put the information officer's talents to work for himself.

Fourteen of the sixteen reporters interviewed in this study believed that the Public Information Officers, and their public relations activities, made a contribution to the state's public information system, that informational system by which a person

[illegible] of the Public Information Activity

Wisconsin's legislative respondents believed, as do the author and staff Public Information officers and the legislative leaders who were previously asked in this study, that the public relations activities of the lawmaking bodies have increased the flow of legislative news from the legislature to the public through the media (see Table 5.1). The respondents thought this was especially true for those segments of the public which depended upon the weekly newspapers and/or local radio stations for their news of legislative activity.

The respondents also believed (see Table 5.5) that the Public Information officers, because of their media experience and their knowledge of how the various media systems operated, were effective advocates for the legislature who sought to communicate with the public via the media. Tables 5.4 and 5.6 corroborate. One reason that the Information officers have been able to increase the flow of legislative news would appear to be their expertise in the mass communication field. And, if the legislative Public Information officers have increased the flow of legislative news they might reasonably be considered as effective advocates for the legislature who desired to put the Information officers ability to work for themselves.

Features of the existing legislative Information in this study believed that the Public Information Officers, and their public relations activities, made a contribution to the state's public information system, that informational queries by state a persons

Table 5.5

Reporters' Opinions as to the Effect of the Public Information Officer's Public Relations Activities Upon the Legislative News Flow

Responses	Number mentioning (N = 16)
Increased flow	15
Decreased flow	0
No effect upon flow	0
Don't know	1
Total	16

Table 5.6

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether the PIO is an Effective Channel for a Legislator Desiring to Communicate Via the Media

Responses	Number responding (N = 16)
Yes	15
No	0
Depends	1
Total	16

TABLE 5.2

Respondents' opinions as to the effect of the Public Information Officer's Public Relations Activities upon the Legislative Task Size

Response	Number responding (N = 16)
Increased Size	10
Decreased Size	1
No effect upon Size	0
Don't Know	1
Total	12

TABLE 5.3

Respondents' opinions as to whether the PIO is an Effective Element for a Legislative Committee to Communicate Via the Media

Response	Number responding (N = 16)
Yes	12
No	0
Neutral	3
Total	15

learns of the activities of his state government. The reporters' opinions on that point are given in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether the Activities Make a Contribution to the State's Public Information System

Responses	Number responding (N = 16)
Yes	14
No	2
Depends	0
Total	16

One legislative reporter explained his affirmative answer to that question in these words:

> I think the contribution would be getting across the statements of the members to the people of the districts back home, in helping them know the positions of their legislators on issues that are not necessarily of statewide importance.

Another reporter who thought that the information officers' activities made a contribution to the state's public information system gave as his answer that:

> They do assist in getting out to the grass roots the opinions of their elected representatives. They assist, particularly, since the local media is not very aggressive in doing this job.

Other legislative reporters mentioned that they thought that the information officers helped increase the general level of knowledge of state government by the public; made the public more aware of

among of the activities of the state government. The responses

questions on this point are given in Table V.7.

Table V.7

Governors' opinions as to whether the activities
have a contribution to the state's
public information service

Response	Public respondents (N = 32)
Yes	32
No	0
Opinions	0
Total	32

The legislative reporter emphasized the effectiveness answer to that question in these words:

> I think the contribution would be getting across the state-wide of the problems in the minds of the legislators back home; in helping them make the problems of their legislators on issues that are not necessarily of statewide importance.

Another reporter has stated that the information officers' activities made a contribution to the state's public information system gave as the answer that:

> They do assist in getting out to the press news the problems of their elected representatives. They assist, particularly, since the local media is not very aggressive in doing this job.

Other legislative reporters mentioned that they thought that the information officers helped increase the general level of knowledge of state government by the public; made the public more aware of

legislative activity; helped the public know of what went on in state legislative politics; and, that the Public Information Officers also brought items to the attention of the reporters covering the legislature which might otherwise have gone by unnoticed. One of the two legislative reporters who responded negatively to the question of whether the public relations activities made a contribution to the state's public information system explained his belief as follows:

> I think it is more waste of money [the legislative public relations activities] and a little more insidious since they are working to get their legislators re-elected again at public expense. I dislike that more than I dislike the average agency PR man.

REPORTERS' RELATIONS WITH BOTH LEGISLATORS AND PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS

From the standpoint of Wisconsin's legislative reporters, the caucus staff Public Information Officer has affected only in a minimal manner if at all the relationship of reporter and legislator (see Table 5.8). Most of the reporters who thought that the information officer positions had affected their relationship with legislators believed those positions had affected that relationship only in an indirect sense. Those reporters viewed the Public Information Officers as standing in the background waiting to assist reporters in their dealings with legislators if the reporters so desired. Only one of the sixteen reporters believed that the Public Information Officer was both an aid and an obstruction in the relationship of reporter and legislator. As that reporter saw it, the information officers had taken over the role of "sounding board" from the legislative

reporter who for years had been the testing place for legislators' ideas. Most of the reporters who thought that the Public Information Officer positions had not affected their relationship with legislators did not believe that the information officers even entered into their sphere of activity. They viewed the Public Information Officers as "non-entities" and held a "live and let live" attitude toward them.

Table 5.8

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether the PIO Position Had Affected the Relationship of Reporter and Legislator

Responses	Number responding (N = 16)
Yes	0
No	10
To a degree	6
Total	16

Table 5.9 relates that only one of the sixteen reporters considered the Public Information Officers to be, and to his mind in only a small way, a barrier to news coverage of the legislature. The table discloses by implication that, in the reporters' opinions, the information officers have not been inserted between themselves and legislators as "buffers" or "funnels." As discussed earlier (see Chapter 4), legislators look upon their Public Information Officers as technical assistants and not as personal spokesmen or as press

secretaries. Legislators generally do not attempt to structure their news flow through the information officers of the four caucus staffs. The legislative reporters view the Public Information Officers as "third" or "unnecessary" steps impinging upon the interaction of legislator and reporter. The reporters view the information officers as incidental, non-essential persons on the periphery of their news-gathering efforts whom they mainly avoid or bypass in their work. The reporters' attitude was why go to the information officer when you can go directly to the "source," the legislator himself. The legislative reporters do not consider the Public Information Officer to be a spokesman for legislators.

Table 5.9

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether the PIOs Are Barriers to News Coverage of the Legislature

Responses	Number responding (N = 16)
Yes	0
No	15
Depends	1
Total	16

Most of the legislative reporters, as shown by Table 5.10, thought that the caucus staffs' Public Information Officer positions helped rather than hindered them in covering state legislative

memorandum. Legislators generally do not attempt to circumvent their own Office through the information officers of the four census staffs. The legislative respondents view the Public Information Officers as "biased" or "unnecessary" since legislators know the information of legislative and reporters. The respondents view the information officers as incidental, non-essential persons on the periphery of their news-gathering efforts whose duty merely avoid or bypass so their news. The respondents' attitude was why go to the information officers when one go directly to the reporter, the legislative himself. The legislative respondents do not consider the Public Information Officer to be a spokesman for legislators.

Table 5.2

Numerical Ratings as to Whether the Type
Are Effective in Some Functions
of the Legislature

Functions	Under Consideration ($n = 34$)
Yes	0
No	32
Reports	2
Total	34

Most of the legislative respondents, as shown in Table 5.2, thought that the census staffs' Public Information Officer positions helped rather than hindered them in presenting their legislative

activity. The reporters indicated that they derived some benefit from the Public Information Officers' public relations activities. They thought that the information officers could provide background information on legislative activity if a reporter sought it. In addition, the legislative reporters believed that the information officers could provide accurate details for stories, especially because of their position within the research effort of the caucus staff. About one-third of the reporters said that they could obtain usable quotes from legislators via staff originated press releases. Those reporters stated that by lifting quotes from press releases they saved themselves the time and trouble of chasing down legislators to get quotes from them. Furthermore, lifting quotes from releases practically precluded any chance that a legislator could claim that a reporter misquoted him on a subject.

Table 5.10

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether the PIO Positions Help or Hinder a Reporter in Covering the State Legislature

Responses	Number responding (N - 16)
Helps	11
Hinders	0
Depends	1
No effect	4
Total	16

activity. The legislators interviewed then had divided into benefit from the public information officers' public relations activities, they thought that the information officers would provide beneficial information on legislative activity if a reporter asking for it. In addition, the legislators respondents believed that the information officers would provide useful ideas for stories, regardless of their position relative to the reporting action of the press. Some non-taking of the reporters said that they could obtain useful information from legislators with their independent press relations. These reporters stated that by talking to their press relations staff around newsworkers the time was needed to consult the legislators to get quotes from them. Furthermore, letting people from legislators personally provided may assume that a legislator would allow such a reporter attached the on a problem.

TABLE 5.16

Importance Ranked as to Whether the PIO Facilitates Help or Hinder a Reporter in Covering the State Legislature

Response	Public Relations (N = 12)
Helps	12
Hinders	0
Depends	0
No effect	0
Total	24

A similar number of reporters, about one-third of those interviewed, believed that the Public Information Officers' activities served them as a warning device forecasting what might come next in the legislative arena. In other words, the press releases and radio tapes revealed, in some cases, what legislators were interested in. In that sense, the press releases and radio tapes could be considered as "intelligence" reports for legislative reporters.

All five electronic media reporters interviewed believed that press conferences called by legislators with caucus staff (and Public Information Officer) assistance were beneficial to them in covering legislative news. No print media reporter mentioned that press conferences were beneficial in gathering legislative news. Print media reporters generally thought that press conferences were "staged" for the benefit of the electronic media and were poor sources of news. However, electronic media reporters, because of the logistical demands associated with their newsgathering efforts, stated that they benefitted from the "orderliness" of press conferences.

Reporters covering the Wisconsin Legislature generally avoid the legislative Public Information Officers in their newsgathering efforts. However, reporters do occasionally approach individual information officers or other caucus staff personnel in their newsgathering. Table 5.11 depicts the frequency with which the legislative reporters acknowledged that they sought out a Public Information Officer as a source of news in their newsgathering activities. About two-thirds of the reporters interviewed stated that they, in fact,

A similar number of respondents, about one-third of those interviewed, believed that the Public Information Officers interviewed serve from six to seven months throughout which might even begin in the legislative session. In other words, the press releases and media logs revealed, in some cases, that legislators were interviewed in. In that sense, the press releases and media logs could be considered as "legislative" reports for legislative reporters.

All five electronic media reporters interviewed believed that power conferences called by legislators that cannot itself (not Public Information Officers) contribute more benefited to view in covering legislative news. Six print media reporter mentioned that press conferences were beneficial in gathering legislative news. Print media reporters generally thought that press conferences were "staged" for the benefit of the electronic media and were poor sources of news. However, electronic media reporters, because of the legislative deadline associated with their newsgathering efforts, stated that they benefited and from the "orchestrated" of press conferences.

Reporters covering the Tidewater legislators generally avoid the Legislative Public Information Officers in their newsgathering efforts. However, reporters do occasionally approach individual information officers or other staff personnel in their newsgathering. Table 5.11 depicts the frequency with which the legislative reporters acknowledged that they sought out a Public Information Officer as a source of news in their newsgathering activities. About twenty-six of the reporters interviewed stated that they, in fact,

approached the information officers or other caucus staff members in their search for news. One reporter considered both caucus staff members and the caucus staff Public Information Officers to be good news "sources." He said: "The secret is that very few reporters know this. And, I hope not many figure this out."

Table 5.11

Frequency of Reporter Approaching a Public Information Officer for Gathering News

Frequency	Number responding (N = 16)
Daily	1
Weekly	4
Less often	5
Never	6
Total	16

Six reporters, by virtue of the length of time that they had been assigned to cover Wisconsin's Legislature, had personally witnessed, for the most part, the establishment and growth of the legislature's caucus staffs. Table 5.12 relates the opinions of those six reporters as to whether any change of legislator accessibility had resulted from the creation of the Public Information Officer positions. Five of the six reporters believed that no such change had taken place.

But, one reporter believed that accessibility of legislators

approached the interrogation officers or other among their members to their parent for news. Not reporter considered both towns which members but the owners which Public Information Officers to be good news reporters." He said: "The parent is then they the reporters know this. And, I hope was keep figure this out."

Table 5.11

Frequency of Reporters Approaching a Public Information Officer for Guidance from Members

Frequency	Number responding (N = 14)
Daily	1
Weekly	3
Less often	5
Never	4
Total	14

His reporters, by virtue of the length of time that they had been assigned to Wonderbrite's Laboratory, had personally witnessed, for the most part, the interactions and events of the Legislature's member staffs. Table 5.12 reviews the opinions of these six reporters as to whether any change of legislator accessibility had resulted from the accession of the Public Information Officer position. Five of the six reporters believed that no such change had taken place.

Not one reporter believed that accessibility of legislators

had undergone change. He thought that the change was towards more restrictive accessibility on the part of legislators. He argued that the lessening of legislator accessibility was being brought about by the more subtle influences of "partisan staffing in general."

Table 5.12

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether Legislators' Accessibility Changed Since the Creation of the PIO Positions

Responses	Number responding (N = 16)
Yes	1
No	5
Don't know	10*
Total	16

*The ten reporters in this category disqualified themselves from the question believing that their short experience in covering the legislature did not give them a basis for a valid judgment. However, the other six reporters had covered the legislature for an extended period of time paralleling in time the growth of the caucus staffs.

The reporter went on to explain how legislators, who used to work strictly at their desks in house chambers, now had private or semi-private offices and secretaries. As he saw it, legislators were a little harder to locate now than before. Besides, he contended that the caucus staffs were influencing how the legislators were performing generally and how they were dealing with the media. Since the

and undergoes change. He insists that the change has actually been restrictive accountability on the part of legislators. He argued that the lessening of legislator accountability was taken through about by his own admits influences of "partisan staffing to promote."

TABLE 4.12

Reporters' Opinions as to Whether Legislators' Accountability Changed Since the Creation of the ETS Positions

Response	Number responding (N = 14)
Yes	3
No	5
Don't know	1[a]
Total	10

[a]The one reporter in this category distinguished himself from the remaining 10 reporters that their minds about questions to consider the legislators did not give them a basis for a valid response. However, he noted the reporters in his covered the legislators for an extended period of time permitting to take the growth of the common staffs.

The reporter used to explain the legislators, who used to meet privately in their member to have discussions, now had private on staff. Private offices and conferences. As he saw it, legislators were a little harder to locate one time before. Besides, he remembered the common staffs were full-staffing now the legislators were performing personally and he-they were dealing with his media. Since the

changes being effected by the caucus staffs were small and somewhat "invisible," this reporter believed that his fellow reporters tended to ignore the changes he perceived taking place. He cited the "educational" function of the caucus staffs and the Public Information Officers as subtly affecting and changing legislator accessibility. He thought that the "educational" function of the caucus staffs brought about legislator sophistication in media relations. The reporter believed that legislators who were sophisticated in media relations often attempted to use their dealings with the media in such a way as to further their personal political game-plans. And, he was afraid that this was beginning to happen in the Wisconsin Legislature. Douglass Cater, in his The Fourth Branch of Government, may have been intimating perceptions similar to those expressed by the reporter cited above when he wrote:

> . . . At their annual meetings, members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors sound the alarm over the growth of government press agentry. So far, it must be added, they have tended to direct their energies at such obvious and comparatively harmless symptoms as the mimeographed handout, while neglecting more subtle manifestations.[8]

Only one of the six reporters who had observed the caucus staffs' growth thought legislative news reporting was easier now than before the creation of those staffs. He believed this to be so because the caucus staffs and their Public Information Officers made more information available for reporters through their public relations and research activities. The other five reporters believed that neither the caucus staffs nor the Public Information Officers had

made legislative newsgathering either easier or more difficult. They did believe, however, that the task of reporting legislative activity had grown more difficult simply because of the heavier legislative workload brought about by governmental expansion and its resulting complexity.

The majority of reporters believed that the Public Information Officers were technically competent in the performance of their public relations activity. They attributed that technical competency to the individual officer's past media experience. But, the reporters did register a few complaints against the caucus staffs and the Public Information Officers in regard to their performance. Some of those complaints were that the Public Information Officers did not know the members of the Capitol Press Corps; that the information officers could be of more assistance to the Capitol Press Corps through the dissemination of such things as "policy" or "position papers" which would give in-depth explanations of why the caucus or caucus members were taking certain positions on legislation; that the public relations efforts were "overproducing" press releases and radio tapes at the taxpayers' expense; and, they also complained that the public relations activities of the various caucuses were "overly partisan."

Two reporters worried that out-state news outlets had little way of determining the veracity of news materials supplied to them by the caucus staffs. In fact, some of the reporters wondered if the out-state editors or news directors knew how the materials they received on their local legislator originated? This group of reporters

such legislative manipulation without causing so much difficulty. They did believe, however, that the task of reporting legislative activity has grown much difficult simply because of the increase legislative workload brought about by governmental expansion and its resultant complexity.

The majority of reporters believed that the Public Information Officers were instrumental in the performance of their public relations activity. They attributed this increased cooperation to the individual efforts of each agency representative. But, the reporters did mention a few complaints against the session staffs and the Public Information Officers in regard to their performance. Some of these complaints were that the Public Information officers did not know the members of the Legislative Press Corps; that the information officers would be at more convenience to the Legislative Press Corps through the dissemination of such things as "Daily" or "weekly progress report which would give bi-lingual explanations of why the bills or action matters were being carried out; the reporters as legislators felt the public relations officers were "overprotecting" press releases for their bosses as the "employee" expected; and, some felt the overprotecting was the public relations substitute of the previous excuses were "weekly briefings."

Two reporters mentioned that sometimes some private and civic rep- of determining the necessity of more information requested to them by the source agency. In fact, some of the reporters mentioned if the information officer or most elsewhere have the information they received on their legislative activities. This group of reporters

firmly believed that the local editors did not know of the partisan arrangement responsible for disseminating the legislative news they received.

Table 5.13 presents the ratings given by the legislative reporters to the press coverage of the state legislature. Only one reporter categorized his rating of the news coverage in a negative manner, the first to do so of all respondents interviewed. Most reporters thought that legislative news coverage could be better, if more media personnel were assigned to cover the legislature; if the reporters had more time to do "in-depth" reporting; if the volume of legislative activity decreased; and, for broadcast reporters, if facilities were provided and regulations changed by the legislature so as to facilitate radio and television coverage of the legislature.[9]

Table 5.13

Reporters' Ratings of the Press Coverage of the Wisconsin Legislature

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Number responding (N = 16)	4	8	3	1	16

The reporters interviewed in this study indicated a general dislike for the legislative public relations efforts coming from the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers. However, as cited by tables earlier in this chapter, the reporters pointed out that they gained some benefit from those activities, and even from the information

firmly believed that the board members did not know of the previous environmental responsibility the Bicentennial Day legislation was then involved.

Table 5.11 presents the ratings given by the legislative reporters to the press coverage of the state legislature. Only one reporter categorized his ratings of this news coverage in a negative manner, the first to do so of all respondents interviewed. Most reporters felt that legislative news coverage could be better, if more media personnel were assigned to cover the legislature. If the reporters had more time to do "in-depth" reporting of the actions of legislative activity documents and, for broadcast reporters, if facilities were provided and regulations changed by the legislature so as to facilitate radio and television coverage of the legislature.[9]

Table 5.11

Reporters' Ratings of the Press Coverage of the Minnesota Legislature

Ratings	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Number responding (N = 14)	6	7	1	14

The reporters interviewed in this study indicated a general dislike for the legislative public relations efforts coming from the House staff: Public Information Officers. However, as stated in earlier analysis in this chapter, the reporters pointed out that they gained some benefit from these activities, and even from the information

officers themselves, in their reportorial task of gathering and disseminating legislative news to the public.

Reporters, according to Cater, are powerful persons as government views them. He wrote:

> The power they exercise is continuing and substantive. They are the articulators of those events of government which they and their bosses deem worthy of note. Their strength stems from their ability to select--to define what is news and what isn't.[10]

Moreover, public officials and elected representatives place importance upon their relations with reporters because of their need for publicity. As Rosten stated:

> Newspaper publicity is the legislator's life-line, his most potent method of keeping "the folks back home" alert to his achievements and his stature. The Congressman who has aspirations for re-election cannot afford to adopt a cavalier air to the newspaperman who controls the news which his constituents read.[11]

But, Wisconsin's legislators have created a mechanism and a method by which they can skirt the "gatekeeper" role of the full-time Capitol Press Corps reporters and place localized "news" materials, put together by supporting staff efforts, in the hands of local editors and/or local news directors where those materials have a greater chance of gaining access to the limited media space and time available. The following chapter will demonstrate that the caucus staff Public Information Officers, and the caucus staff members, have been successful in their attempts to win media space and/or time for their public relations materials.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 5

[1]William L. Rivers, "Appraising Press Coverage of Politics," Politics And The Press, ed. Richard W. Lee (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1970), pp. 51-52.

[2]Leo C. Rosten, The Washington Correspondents (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937), p. 3.

[3]American Institute For Political Communication, The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship (Washington, D.C.: American Institute For Political Communication, 1966), p. 16.

[4]David S. Broder, "Politicians And Biased Political Information," Politics And The Press, ed. Richard W. Lee (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1970), p. 16.

[5]Ibid., pp. 64-65.

[6]Joseph H. Mader, "Government Press Bureaus And Reporting Of Public Affairs," Journalism Quarterly, 19, No. 2 (June, 1942), 174.

[7]See Senate Resolution 27, State of Wisconsin Senate Journal, May 27, 1971, in reference to the remarks made by this reporter. That resolution: "Resolved by the senate, That the state auditor be directed to audit within 60 days all executive departments and agencies with an eye to identifying the total cost of public relations spending, including salaries, and the total number of personnel involved in influencing public or legislative opinion and policy, including their degree of involvement." The results of that audit are available from both the Legislative Fiscal Bureau and the Legislative Audit Bureau. Both of those agencies participated in that audit. The legislative caucus staffs' Public Information Officers were not counted in that audit.

[8]Douglass Cater, The Fourth Branch Of Government, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), p. 165.

[9]A controversy arose on the Senate floor during late May, 1971 concerning supposed "bugging" of the Senate by the Republican caucus staff. The Republican caucus staff was accused of taping remarks made on the floor via a speaker system in their office. This was being done for use in future election campaigns. Such taping was supposedly in violation of legislative rules which did not allow the recording of floor debate. Two radio reporters took the opportunity and brought a court suit against the legislature on the taping prohibition. The legislature dropped its prohibitions on tape recording floor debate and the newsmen dropped the court suit. The legislature

[illegible]

[1]William L. Rivers, "Appraising Four Dimensions of Politics," Politics and the Press, ed. Edward C. Lee (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1972), pp. 51-52.

[2]Lee C. Bollman, The Washington Correspondent (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1972), p. 1.

[3]American Institute for Political Communication, The Effects Government-Daily Press Relationship (Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Political Communication, 1970), p. 12.

[4]Neil C. Brown, "Politicians and Biased Political Reporting," Politics and the Press, ed. Edward C. Lee (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1970), p. 76.

[5]Ibid., pp. 64-65.

[6]Joseph C. Harsh, "Government Press Powers and Reporting of Public Affairs," Journalism Quarterly 47, no. 2 (Sum, 1970), 19.

[7]The Florida Legislature 27, Study of Florida's Public Schools, May 27, 1971. In reference to the Pensacola case by the Legislature, this resolution: "Resolved by the people, that the state shall be directed to study, utilize or deny all educational experiments, and operate with an eye to identifying the total cost of public elementary education, including capital, and the total number of personnel involved in influencing public or legislative opinion on policy, including their degree of involvement." The results of this study and activities from both the Legislative Fiscal Bureau and the Legislature with regard to those agencies participated in this study. The Legislature course utilize Public Information officers who are required to view media.

[8]Stephen Ward, The Public Image of Government, Washington: Brookings Institution, 1970), p. 112.

[9]A controversy arose in the Bonita Times during late May, 1971 concerning supposed "flogging" of two teenagers by the Pensacola county sheriff. The Legislative Council held the attention of leading reports made on the floor via a speaker phone to their office. This was being done for use in future briefing sessions. Such taping was apparently in violation of legislative rules which do not allow the recording of floor debate. The media reporters took the opportunity and lengthy a story and against the legislature on the taping procedure. The legislature dropped the prohibition on that recording from state rules and the newsmen dropped the story with. The legislature

then installed special jacks to accommodate tape recording from the floor microphone system. See Charlotte Robinson's, "Senate OKs Taping By Newsmen," in The Capital Times [Madison] June 8, 1971, for a report of the taping controversy.

[10] Cater, The Fourth Branch Of Government, pp. 13-14.

[11] Rosten, The Washington Correspondents, p. 79.

Chapter 6

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC RELATIONS AND NEWS COVERAGE OF WISCONSIN'S LEGISLATURE

The caucus staffs' Public Information Officers, their legislative leaders, and the legislative reporters all believed that the public relations activities performed by the caucus staffs had increased the flow of legislative news reaching the public. They based their beliefs upon their own personal involvement with those activities or upon their personal observation of increased print and electronic media coverage of the legislature and its members. But, it is not necessary to rely wholly upon the personal observation of those three groups for evidence that the legislative public relations efforts have brought about increased media coverage of legislative activity. Dr. Alan Rosenthal of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, a student of the Wisconsin Legislature, has made two newspaper content analyses which found an increase in legislative news coverage over time. Dr. Rosenthal attributed the increase in printed coverage to the caucus staffs' public relations efforts.

Rosenthal's first study of press coverage afforded the Wisconsin Legislature concerned itself with the press coverage given legislative activity by Madison's Capital Times.[1] Rosenthal studied that paper for the periods January through June in 1961 and 1967. These two periods allowed a comparison of news coverage prior to the

Chapter 6

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC RELATIONS AND THE
CONTROL OF WISCONSIN'S LEGISLATURE

The course studies' Public Information Officers, their legislative liaisons, and the legislative reporters all believed that the public relations activities performed by the course staffs had increased the flow of legislative news reaching the public. They based their beliefs upon their own personal involvement with these activities or upon their personal observation of increased press and electronic media coverage of the legislature and its members. But, it is not necessary to rely solely upon the personal observations of these three groups for evidence that the legislative public relations efforts have brought about increased media coverage of legislative activity. Dr. John Bennett of the Graduate Institute of Politics, a student of the Wisconsin Legislature, has made two newspaper content analyses which found an increase in legislative news coverage over time. Dr. Bennett attributed the increase in printed coverage to the course staffs' public relations efforts.

Bennett's first study of press coverage affirmed the Wisconsin legislature overcomes itself with the great coverage given legislative activity by Madison's Capital Times.[1] Bennett studied that paper for the periods January through June in 1961 and 1967. These two periods allowed a comparison of news coverage prior to the

creation of the caucus staffs (1961) with press coverage two years after the creation of those staffs (1967). His analysis was based on the coverage given to the speaker, majority leader, assistant majority leader, minority leader, and assistant minority leader in the lower house of the legislature--the Assembly; and, the majority leader, assistant majority leader, minority leader, and assistant minority leader in the upper house--the Senate. Rosenthal's press analysis was a part of a study in which he attempted to assess the effects of partisan staffing upon Wisconsin's Legislature.

Rosenthal used The Capital Times as subject of the study because while the legislature is in session many legislators follow legislative activity through that paper. The Capital Times study by Rosenthal revealed that: "From 1961 to 1967 the number of column lines devoted to reports on leadership almost doubled."[2] Rosenthal also examined the newspaper coverage in relation to staff-originated press releases. He explained in a footnote to his article that:

> An effort was made to distinguish between column-line coverage based on press releases (characterized by no byline, a distinctive format, etc.) and that based on reporter observation, interviews, and press conferences. Estimations of the number of column lines stimulated by press releases are necessarily approximate.[3]

While Rosenthal found little increase for the Senate, in the number of lines based on press releases, he found significant increases in coverage based on press releases for the Assembly leadership. He wrote of the Assembly:

> . . . In the 1961 session 13 percent of the total coverage received by the Republican leaders and 28 percent of that

examples of the Senate debate (1964) with great emphasis has placed after the breakdown of those debates (1967). The analysis was based on the averages given in the speeches, majority leader, assistant majority leader, minority leader, and assistant minority leader in the lower house of the legislature--the assembly--and the majority leader, assistant majority leader, minority leader, and assistant minority leader in the upper house--the Senate. Dworkin's prior analysis was a part of a study to begin to distinguish or measure the effects of partisan conflict upon the-decision-making legislators.

Dworkin used The Digital Time as subject of the study because with the legislature is in session each legislature roll-call activity occurs each week. The Digital Times study by Dworkin revealed lower [illegible] to fall the number of roll-call votes received in reports on legislative issues.[7] Dworkin also examined the assumption concerning the relationship between press coverage and the [illegible] of a [illegible] in a [illegible] in the [illegible]

An effort was made to distinguish between [illegible] coverage based on press release [illegible] by [illegible], a [illegible] [illegible], and [illegible] based on reporter observation, interviews, and press conferences. Particularly of the number of roll-call votes [illegible] by press releases are necessarily exhaustive.

While Dworkin found little increase for the Senate, in the number of votes based on press releases, he found significant increases in coverage based on press release for the assembly leadership. He wrote of the assembly:

> . . . In the 1961 session 11 percent of the total coverage received by the Speaker [illegible] and 7% percent of [illegible]

> received by Democratic leaders derived from press releases. In the 1967 session the proportions had risen to 19 percent and 37 percent respectively.[4]

Those findings led him to conclude that:

> . . . This growth is surely a product of the publicity endeavors of the Assembly analysts. It indicates, moreover, that Assembly staff, responding to its leaders, was formulating the messages that were then reported by the press.[5]

Rosenthal's analysis of The Capital Times' legislative coverage predated the creation of the Public Information Officer positions within the caucus staffs.[6] Thus, that analysis examined the initial moves of the first "caucus analysts" into the communication/public relations area. Rosenthal's study portrays how the Assembly caucus staffs moved more quickly into this area than did the caucus staffs in the Senate. Dr. Rosenthal further cited the emerging "educational" function of the caucus analysts in regards to assisting legislators in media relations.

> With regard to communication, there were indirect as well as direct effects. Staff helped familiarize leaders with techniques designed to capture the attention of the press. One analyst, in particular, taught leaders for whom he worked how to approach capital correspondents and how to be aggressive rather than passive in communicating the news they wanted reported.[7]

In a later paper, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," Rosenthal, to get an indication of caucus staff effectiveness in the communication area, analyzed the press coverage of sixty-six papers from throughout Wisconsin.[8] Eight daily and fifty-eight weekly Wisconsin newspapers were analyzed in that study. Rosenthal focused upon print media coverage in a sample of sixteen Assembly districts. He wrote this author that:

> . . . Districts were chosen to represent those with the same Republicans, different Republicans, the same Democrats, different Democrats, and Democrats which formerly were Republicans for the two years. Districts with only large dailies were excluded; so were those that had been significantly reapportioned.[9]

The papers were analyzed for the periods January through June of 1963 and 1967. In that study, Rosenthal found that:

> . . . Although the amount of overall space devoted to news did not change substantially during this period, there was a tremendous rise in the coverage given local legislators. Total column-lines expanded from about 6,000 in 1963 to about 12,500 in 1967, more than 100 percent. The number of articles increased by almost 150 percent. Separate articles on members, legislator names appearing in headlines, and first-page placement all doubled. Certainly, much of the increased and improved coverage was attributable to the publicity endeavors of the Assembly staffs.[10]

Where Rosenthal's Capital Times study had focused upon the press coverage afforded legislative leaders, the latter study (just cited) dealt with all legislators. As the caucus staffs evolved, as discussed in Chapter 2, they defined their roles. Rosenthal's two studies depict indirectly how the "caucus analysts" initially catered to the leadership of the caucus and then moved to serve other legislators in the caucus.

CATEGORIZING A WEEK'S NEWS

In order to build upon Rosenthal's findings as to the increase of press coverage brought about by the publicity endeavors of the caucus staffs, this researcher subscribed to a professional clipping service for the week of October 3-9, 1971. The clipping service was instructed to provide the author all items, from all Wisconsin papers (both dailies and weeklies), mentioning legislative activity and/or

individual legislators. A total of two hundred seventy-eight newspapers, thirty-six dailies and two hundred forty-two weeklies, were scrutinized by the clipping service for the week of October 3-9, 1971.[11] The clipping service had handled similar requests for such items from the legislative caucus staffs themselves for some time, and so the clipping service had some expertise in searching out items of this type.

Those items were then categorized by article type and the number of articles per category was determined. The purpose of this phase of this research was to gain an indication of the amount of one week's newspaper coverage given the legislature and/or legislators which was based upon material originated as press releases by legislators themselves, or, by the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers. Table 6.1 presents the results of that categorization and quantification of legislative news for the week of October 3-9, 1971.

A total of seven hundred fifty-four items mentioning either legislative activity or individual legislators were uncovered in the analysis. Included in those seven hundred fifty-four items were forty-seven legislator initiated columns. These columns were easily identifiable by format and title, such as, "Legislative Report From Representative"; "Capitol Comment"; "From The Desk Of . . ."; "Legislative Newsletter"; "Report From The Capitol"; "Representative's Report"; or, "At The Capitol." (Table 4.14, in Chapter 4, related that sixty-two of the ninety-nine legislators responding to the anonymous questionnaire stated that they had such a periodic personal

Table 6.1

Categorization of News Articles Mentioning Legislative Activity and/or Individual Legislators from All Wisconsin Papers Week of October 3-9, 1971*

Type of article	Number of articles
Wire Service Stories	
AP	235
UPI	58
Byline Stories	
Wire Service	14
Non Wire Service	86
Reporter Observed Stories	130
Editorials	51
Letters to the Editor	14
Pictures	10
Cartoons	1
Legislator Initiated Columns	
In Daily Papers	10
In Weekly Papers	37
Legislator Initiated Releases	
In Daily Papers	40
In Weekly Papers	41
Other Releases	27
Total All Articles	754

*A total of two hundred seventy-eight newspapers were read, thirty-six dailies and two hundred forty-two weeklies. The papers are listed in the 1971 Directories and Rate Book of the Wisconsin Press Association, headquartered in Madison, Wisconsin.

Table 6.1

Characteristics of State Legislators Controlling Legislative Activity Against Legislative Initiative Type 111 Alternative Payment Bills of Southern N.Y. 1969*

Type of activity	Number of activities
Line Setting Stances	
AP	111
NPI	23
Bills Passed	
Line Service	11
Non Line Service	8
Specific Textual Studies	133
Subpoenas	5
Letters to the Editor	1
Speeches	12
Conferences	7
Legislator Initiated Contacts	
In Party Terms	11
In Policy Terms	17
Legislator Initiated Responses	
In Party Terms	1
In Policy Terms	14
Other Behaviors	27
Total All Activities	75

*A total of ten Medical Assembly-Joint Committee roll call, highly-cited bills and ten Medical Society-sponsored bills. The groups are listed in the Lib Directories and data sheet of the Elections. These bills, both, contained in Sections, Alternative.

newspaper column.) Those forty-seven columns appeared in forty-four different papers.

Determining the number of articles based upon press releases initiated by legislators or their staff assistants proved a little more difficult than uncovering the legislator originated columns. This author had seen and read numerous caucus staff produced press releases during the course of this study. Generally, if an item could not be placed in any other category (as listed in Table 6.1) it was suspected of being a press release. If the item resembled in format those press releases previously encountered by the author they were then counted as legislator originated releases (that category included those releases drawn up by the Public Information Officers, other caucus staff personnel, and administrative assistants). Eighty-one items were identified as legislator originated releases in this manner.

The two categories, Legislator Initiated Columns and Legislator Releases, totalled one hundred twenty-eight items or almost seventeen percent of all the items that week mentioning legislative activity and/or individual legislators. The results of this categorization effort should be taken as only a tentative indication of the effect of the public relations activities of the caucus staffs upon the weekly flow of legislative news. That is especially so since no base-line data was used from which to compare any change over time brought about by the caucus staffs' public relations efforts.

Since this categorization dealt only with press releases

newspaper column.) Those forty-seven volumes appeared in forty-four different papers.

Speculating on the number of articles based upon press releases initiated by legislators or their staff assistants proved a little more difficult than considering the legislator-originated columns. This author had seen and read numerous newspaper staff prepared press releases during the course of this study. Generally, if an item could not be placed in any other category (as listed in Table 6.1) it was suspected of being a press release. If the item resembled in format those press releases previously associated by the author they were then removed as legislator originated columns (this category included those releases drawn up by the Public Information Officers, other column staff members, and administrative assistants). Eighty-four items were considered as legislator originated releases in this manner.

The two categories, legislator initiated columns and legislator initiated, totalled one hundred twenty-eight items or almost seventeen percent of all the items that were monitoring legislative activity and/or individual legislators. The results of this newspaper activity should be taken in only a tentative indication of the effect of the public relations activities of the annual staffs upon the weekly flow of legislative news. That is especially so since no team-like data was used from which to compare by which upon the amount taken by the various staffs' public relations efforts.

Since this correspondence dealt only with press releases

carried by the state's newspapers, the impact of the caucus staffs' releases and tapes upon the state's electronic media remains to be examined. Monitoring news broadcasts for such a purpose would be complex and costly. However, it appears reasonable to assume that the electronic media, by virtue of their limited news staffs and financial resources, will also be found to utilize the caucus-generated news materials much like the print media does in their coverage of legislative activity.

Even with the lack of definitive guidelines for determining the authorship of apparent press releases, the categorization of legislative news presented in this chapter reveals that legislator initiated and/or staff initiated "news" items are a substantial part of a week's newspaper coverage of legislative activity. This finding will be considered along with other findings of the study in the last chapter.

control by the state's government, the legals of the states should remain and leave upon the state's electronic media [illegible] to be monitored. Monitoring some broadcasts for such a purpose would be complex and costly. However, as experts recommend to reduce total the electronic media, by without of state legals were [illegible] and transmission, will also be forced to utilize the [illegible] media than in their knowledge of legislative activity.

Even with the lack of jurisdiction guidelines for determining the controlling of appropriate crime [illegible] the enforcement of legislative acts [illegible] to this [illegible] provide this legislator initiated [illegible] state initiated "[illegible]" [illegible] of a state's [illegible] knowledge of legislative activity. This finding will be considered along with other findings of the study in the last chapter.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 6

[1]Alan Rosenthal, "An Analysis of Institutional Effects: Staffing Legislative Parties in Wisconsin," Journal of Politics, Volume 32 (August, 1970), 531-62.

[2]Ibid., 543-44.

[3]Ibid., 544.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

[6]See Chapter 2 of this study for a chronology of caucus staff growth.

[7]Rosenthal, "An Analysis of Institutional Effects: Staffing Legislative Parties in Wisconsin," 544.

[8]Alan Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin" (manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Robison) September, 1969.

[9]Based on personal correspondence between Dr. Alan Rosenthal, of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, and the writer.

[10]Rosenthal, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," p. 30.

[11]The week of October 3-9, 1971 was selected for the news categorization phase of this research for several reasons. Originally, in the proposal submitted for this thesis, another analysis design was proposed. However, this author discovered that Dr. Alan Rosenthal, of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, had already performed a similar analysis and so a revised analysis design was constructed. When this occurred there were only a few weeks remaining in the 1971 legislative session. This author chose the tentatively scheduled next to last week of the legislative session for the categorization effort. This was done to preclude working with the normally hectic final week of the legislative session. But, as it turned out, the legislature adjourned on October 28, 1971, a week later than anticipated. The legislative Public Information Officers, when queried by this author, related that the week of October 3-9 was somewhat "atypical" as far as their public relations activities were concerned. They generally

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 6

[1]Alan Greenblatt, "An Analysis of Institutional Effects: Auditing Legislative Performance in Washington," Journal of Politics, Volume 30 (August, 1970), 771-82.

[2]Ibid., 781-82.

[3]Ibid., 782.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

[6]See Chapter 2 of this study for a discussion of service shelf space.

[7]Greenblatt, "An Analysis of Institutional Effects: Auditing Legislative Performance in Washington," 782.

[8]Alan Greenblatt, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin" (Manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Hickman) Springfield, 1969.

[9]Based on personal correspondence between Dr. Alan Greenblatt, of the Legislative Institute of Illinois, and the writer.

[10]Greenblatt, "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin," p. 2.

[11]The week of October 3-4, 1971 was selected for the same categorization phase of this research for several reasons. Originally, in the proposed schedule for this chapter, another analysis design was proposed. However, this author discovered that Dr. Alan Greenblatt, of the Legislative Institute of Illinois, had already performed a similar analysis and so a revised analysis design was constructed. Then, this occurred there were only a few weeks remaining in the 1971 Legislative session. This author chose the consecutive weekend week in lieu of the legislative session for the categorization effort. This was done to provide working also the usually busiest final week of the legislative session. But, as it turned out, the legislature adjourned on October 22, 1971, a week later than anticipated. The Legislative Public Information Division, when queried by this author, related that the week of October 3-4 was somewhat "typical" as far as their public relations activities were concerned. They generally

believed they had produced less than the normal amounts of press releases and radio tapes. The information officers stated that they had slightly curtailed their activities out of a sense that the public was growing tired of legislative news after a lengthy ten month session marked by inaction and strong partisanship.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSIONS

This exploratory investigation was designed to illuminate the early growth of public relations activities within the Wisconsin Legislature. This study also attempted to assess the impact of those public relations activities upon the traditional processes of gathering and disseminating legislative news in Wisconsin. An assumption that legislative-originated public relations activities would have an effect upon the way Wisconsinites learned of state legislative activity generated this investigation. A related assumption was that if those legislative public relations activities, in fact, affected the way in which persons learned of state legislative activity, then, some sort of change in the state's political communication process had been brought about. Furthermore, not only would change have been brought about in the state's political communication process, but also, some change would have been brought about in the state's public information system. For that system, the state's public information system, is the system consisting of those informational elements from which a person learns of the activities of his state government.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The study objectives outlined in Chapter 1 were designed to assist this researcher in the research task and to systematically

Chapter 7

CONCLUSIONS

This exploratory investigation was designed to illuminate the early phase of public relations activities within the Tennessee Legislature. This study also attempted to assess the impact of these public relations activities upon the traditional processes of gatekeeping and disseminating legislative news in Tennessee. An assumption that legislator-to-constituent public relations contributes would have an effect upon this map illuminating internal of state legislative activity generated this investigation. A related assumption was that of those legislators public relations activities, in fact, affected the way in which process internal of state legislative activity, thus, some sort of change in the state's political communication process had been brought about. Furthermore, not only would change have been brought about in the state's political communication process, but also, some change would have been brought about in the state's public information system. For that system, the state's public information system, is the system consisting of those informational sources that make a person learns of the activities of his state government.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The study objectives outlined in Chapter 1 were designed to assist this researcher in the research task and to systematically

guide the study to its proposed end of scrutinizing Wisconsin's emerging legislative public relations function. The following overview includes both a recapitulation of the findings of the study and the conclusions that can be drawn from those findings.

Origin and Growth of the Function

Several factors appear to have contributed to the growth of legislative public relations activities in Wisconsin. Those factors pervaded the legislative environment and set a general tone conducive to the implementation of some sort of public relations/communication function in behalf of the legislature and its members. One such factor was the nationwide drive for legislative modernization dating from mid-twentieth century. Reformers dedicated to improving the status and position of the state legislatures organized special interest groups to take on those tasks. Those groups--including the Council of State Governments, the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, and the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures--established nationwide communication networks serving those individuals interested in modernizing state legislatures. The communication networks proved to be instrumental in the dissemination of ideas and information among the special interest groups. Moreover, those communication networks helped diffuse numerous legislative innovations which were adopted by various states. The special interest groups were not blind to their dependency upon public support for the attainment of their long-range plans. Therefore, those groups emphasized, and continue to emphasize,

gains are study to the proposal and of establishing Minnesota's emerging legislative public relations function. The following sections include some a recapitulation of the findings of the study and the conclusions that can be drawn from these findings.

Origin and Growth of the Function

Several factors appear to have contributed to the growth of legislative public relations activities in Minnesota. These factors provided the legislative environment and set a general line conducive to the implementation of some sort of public relations/communication function in behalf of the legislature and its members. One such factor was the substantial drive for legislative modernization arising from mid-twentieth century. Reformers desirous to improve the status and position of the state legislatures supported special interest groups to take on these roles. These groups--including the Council of State Governments, the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, and the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures--established relationships with communication services during those institutions interested in modernizing state legislatures. The communication services proved to be instrumental in the dissemination of ideas and information among the special interest groups. Moreover, these communication services helped diffuse numerous legislative innovations which were adopted by various states. The special interest groups were not silent in their dependency upon public support for the attainment of their long-range plans. Therefore, these groups supplied, and continue to supplied,

the importance of the legislature's relations with the public and also the importance of the legislature's communication with the public in all attempted legislative reform efforts. That emphasis has subsequently been spread across the country by the specialized communication networks serving the different legislative special interest groups. The emphasis upon communication is fostering the implementation of varied public information/public relations programs in state legislatures throughout the fifty states.

Wisconsin's emerging legislative public relations function also mirrors the growth of public relations within American society. America's pluralistic and interdependant society, with its limited communication channels, has engendered sophisticated competition for access to those limited channels. Communication is the thread which ties people together in society and the importance of communication grows as society's complexity increases. And, it is within such a complex environment that the communication function inherent to the American governmental system must operate. Cutlip and Center have written of the environment bringing forth the function of public relations that the environment is marked by an escalation in the competition for the public's attention.

> As public opinion has grown in force and the ways of influence have multiplied, the competition for public favor has steadily escalated. The struggle to align people on the side of one's cause, client, or company has become increasingly competitive.[1]

The size and complexity of society has encouraged the development of specialists versed in communication through the mass media who can

provide an edge for an organization, or for an individual, in the competition for access to the limited communication channels available and for the public's attention.

Another factor influencing the rise of a legislative public relations function in Wisconsin has been the growth of public relations in political campaigning. Stanley Kelley, Jr., and others, have shown that public relations in political campaigning is burgeoning.[2] This is so because the politician faces challenges which he attempts to surmount through communication, and the politician encounters the same competitive environment that all other communicators do. The politician first must gain election by communicating his ideas and drawing supporters to his side. Then, if he is successful at winning elective office, he must communicate with constituents (both those who supported him and those who opposed him) so as to increase the possibility of his own re-election. Communication becomes the thread which binds together the elected official and his constituency.

Politicians on all levels of government--federal, state, and local--are being exposed more and more to the importance of public relations techniques in political campaigning. The use of television in campaigns has contributed significantly to politicians' growing reliance upon the public relations specialist. The sophistication and expensive nature of that medium has forced politicians to seek expert help in their efforts to employ television communication in their political campaigns. Politicians have become concerned about their "images" and how they are coming across to the public. Politicians

[illegible] for an organization, or for the individual; or for competition for members in the United Commonwealth [illegible] and for the public's attention.

Another factor indicating the rise of a legislative public relations function is attempts that have been for groups of public relations in political campaigns. Gordon Tullock, Dr., and others, have shown that public relations in political campaigns is burgeoning.[8] This is in however the political theme contingent which is managed to measure through measurement, and the political measurers the same competition environment that all other organizations do. The political theme first must gain attention by communicating its issues and develop supporters to its side. Then, if he is successful in winning attention, he must maintain that availability (that issue has support) and those who oppose that by so as to increase the possibility of his non-election. Communication becomes the thread which binds together the elected officials and his constituency.

Politicians on all levels of government—federal, state, and local—are being exposed more and more to the importance of public relations techniques in political campaigns. The use of television to emphasize the constituent aspect/relationship to politicians, growing reliance upon the public relations consultant. The institutionalization and appropriate nature of this medium has forced politicians to seek support help in order effective in angle information communication by their political campaigns. Politicians have become [illegible] their "helper" and for that they are [illegible] another in the public. Politicians

have sought out and continue to seek out campaign assistants who can help project the candidate's image to the voters. In most cases, those assistants are grouped together under the title of "PR" (public relations) men. This exposure to and use of public relations techniques by politicians in their campaign efforts may engender a dependency upon such techniques for the politician when and if he gains elective office. That chain-of-events appears to be a factor contributing to the emergence of a public relations emphasis within Wisconsin's Legislature.

Legislators interviewed in this study said they thought that the example of Congressmen in the public relations area also influenced Wisconsin lawmakers in this direction. Implicitly, a struggle for balance of power is involved in both the Congress's and the state legislatures' movement into public relations activities. Both seek to obtain visibility and stature for the legislative branch of government in a governmental system increasingly dominated by the federal-executive branch of government. Besides, both Congress and the state legislatures hope, through their efforts, to counter the efforts of the executive branch of government on their respective levels, in the public relations area. Congress and the state legislatures want to combat the executive's ability to govern by publicity. Former Wisconsin Congressman Melvin Laird told the 1968 Midwest Public Relations Conference at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, that:

> We in the Congress must communicate in a better fashion. And I believe that the Congress of the United States has got to develop its own public information and its own public relations activities to compete with the executive branch of our government.[3]

Laird was arguing for equity in the public relations area for the executive and legislative branches of government. The Congressional example has stimulated interest among Wisconsin legislators in the practice of legislative public relations.

Wisconsin's legislative caucus staffs moved into the public relations area specifically in response to requests for such assistance from individual legislators. The caucus staffs themselves came to be from the legislature's efforts to modernize and better equip itself for the lawmaking function central to its purpose. The combination of desire on the part of legislators for public relations assistance and the availability of staff which could take up that activity brought about the emergence of legislative public relations activities in Wisconsin.

Nature and Scope of the Function

The first moves by the caucus staffs' into the communication/public relations area were print media oriented. "Caucus analysts," who were versed in the newspaper field, assisted legislators in drafting press releases and also educated legislators on how to deal with reporters. Since those initial moves on the part of the evolving caucus staffs, legislators have specifically designated Public Information Officers within those staffs. At first the title Public Information Officer was misleading, because it was given to the chief analyst so as to qualify him for a higher pay scale, but now the Public Information Officer positions encompass public relations type work on an extensive scale. In addition, general staff activity in

staff was lobbying for equity in the public relations area for the executive and legislative branches of government. The Congressional committee was additional leverage among Minnesota legislators in the creation of legislative public relations.

Minnesota's legislature could easily assume that the public relations was specifically in response to requests for such assistance from individual legislators. The source usually therefore seem to be from the legislature's efforts to authorize and secure equity funds for the Committee Clerk's staff in its process. The establishment of duties on the part of legislators for public relations assistance and the availability of staff which could take up that activity indicate some the emergence of legislative public relations activities in Minnesota.

Nature and Scope of the Function

The first person to be course staffer into the communications/public relations area was Paul Wells administrator. "Course analysts" was used varied in the newspaper field, assisted legislators in drafting press releases and also advised legislators on how to deal with reporters. Since Wells initial serve as the part of the analyst course staff, legislators have specifically designated Public Information Officers within house staff. At first the title Public Information Officer was misleading, because it was given to the staff analyst so as to qualify his for a slower pay scale, but now the Public Information Officer positions encompass public relations type work as its primary scale. In addition, general staff activity in

the public relations area has increased. Those public relations activities now performed by the caucus staffs include (see Table 3.1) press releases, radio tapes, speech writing, furnishing assistance with "case" mail, compiling election files, advising on communications generally, assisting with press conferences, and photo preparation and dissemination. Basically, the public relations activities conducted by the partisan staffs are partisan in nature. In that way, the public relations activities of the caucus staffs both do and do not parallel other "public information" type activities. "Public information" activities, in one sense, normally denote neutral information dissemination when applied to some governmental public relations efforts. However, elected and appointed officials also often use "public information" activities to further political ends of an organization or of their own. In that sense, "public information" activities take a partisan slant upon themselves. The ultimate goal of the public relations activities of the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers is to reach the voter and in so doing assist in the re-election of the incumbent legislator. Therefore, the underlying reason for those activities is a political one. So, like some other "public information" activities marked by a partisan motive, the caucus staffs' activities increase the public's knowledge of government for political reasons. Each caucus staff information officer works to improve the political position of legislators who belong to his caucus. The public relations activities generated by the caucus staffs articulate the legislator's partisan point of view.

Though there may be instances in which partisanship is not a major factor, the central thrust of those activities is partisan. As shown by Table 4.14, legislators in the Wisconsin Legislature are availing themselves of the public relations services provided by the caucus staffs in their efforts to communicate with constituents and thereby serve their political aspirations.

Attitudes Toward the Function

The twenty-seven focused interviews with the four caucus staff Public Information Officers, seven legislative leaders, and sixteen reporters covering the legislature furnished the data for the major portion of this study. The insights garnered from the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of those three groups have singled out implications of a legislative public relations function deserving of further evaluation.

The information officers. The caucus staffs' Public Information Officers view themselves as "communication technicians" who are available to assist desiring legislators to communicate specified messages to designated publics. The target audience is generally the legislator's local constituency. According to the information officers, there is a need for communication assistance in behalf of state legislators. That need is related to democracy's requirement of an "informed electorate" and the caucus staffs' communication activity is, as the information officers see it, aimed at fostering such an "informed electorate." The Public Information Officers

Though there may be instances in which participants in not a major factor, the elected leaders of these activities in politics. As minds up their lists, legislators in the Minnesota legislature use emotive dimensions of the public relations function provided by the mission staffs to their advantage to demonstrate with "sensitivity and discern where their political constituents.

Attitudes Toward the Function

The twenty-seven focused interviews with the four census staff Media Information Officers, seven legislative liaisons, and sixteen supervisors serving the legislature functioned the data for the major portion of this study. The insights gathered from the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of these three groups have been elicited and implications of a legislative public relations function deserving of further evaluation.

The Information Officers. The seventy-eight Public Information Officers also expressive of "communication functions" who are available to assist developing legislators to communicate specifical messages to constituent publics. The survey indicates is generally the legislator's local constituency. According to the individual officers, there is a need for communication assistance in behalf of other legislators. That need is related to department's legislation of the "informed constituency" and the various staffs' communication activity is, as the information officers see it, aided in fulfilling such as "informed electorate." The Public Information Officers

believe that their activities have increased the flow of legislative news reaching the public, especially to those segments of the public attentive to local radio stations and weekly newspapers. In addition, the information officers believe that their efforts constitute a contribution to the state's public information system. Through their attempts to "localize" legislative news, the information officers thought they were "supplementing" the work of the privately-owned media serving Wisconsin residents. In fact, the Public Information Officers believe that they have added to the number of sources of legislative news. As a new source of news for the state's political communication process, the caucus staffs' news activities have materially altered the makeup of that process. The caucus staffs' communication endeavors constitute a new "input" element in the state's political communication process.

The Public Information Officers see nothing unusual in their partisan communication activities being supported by public tax monies. They argue that the tax support is justified on the grounds of "informing the public" of governmental activity. Nevertheless, that question remains open to debate.

Unlike the popular conception would have it, Wisconsin's legislative Public Information Officers are not barriers to news coverage of the legislature. The information officers do not consider themselves to be spokesmen for legislators. And, legislators' press relations are not funneled through the information officers. In fact, the Public Information Officers have little to do directly with the reporters who regularly cover legislative activity. But,

the information officers considered themselves to be effective channels for legislators who desire to communicate with the public via the media.

The legislative leaders. The legislative leaders interviewed believe that while there was no "absolute" need for press relations assistance for state legislators, such assistance is a distinct asset. Some legislators believe that the legislative public relations activities are necessary because of the communication requirement demanded by representative democracy. However, the legislators acknowledged that those communication activities could help in a legislator's fight for political survival and that factor was definitely involved in the development of those communication activities.

The emergence of legislative public relations illustrates, as the American Institute for Political Communication has put it, the increasing role of government as a "generator" of news.

> Commencing with Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal in the early thirties, the Federal government has steadily expanded its role as a generator of information as contrasted to the more passive role of "source." The distinction between the two roles is well worth defining if only because it has had and will continue to have revolutionary implications for the political communication process. The term "generator" implies the actual creation of "news" and the promotion of its dissemination to the media and beyond. The term "source" pertains to a person or organization contacted by a media representative for information--the initiative being with the latter. The competent government information officer can and often does function as source and generator simultaneously.
>
> Insofar as the Federal government is concerned, the distinction between "generator" and "source" is more than a matter of initiative in disseminating information. As generator, the Administration in power, creates "news" and fosters its release in many cases for ends which go beyond the objective of informing the

the Information Officers considered themselves to be effective channels for legislators who desire to communicate with the public via the media.

The Legislative Leaders. The legislative leaders interviewed believe that media time was an "adequate" vehicle for press relations activities for state legislators, such assistance is a distinct asset. Some legislators believe that the legislative public relations activities are necessary because of the communication requirements demanded by representative democracy. However, the legislators acknowledged that those communication activities could help in a legislator's fight for political survival and that further use definitely involved in the development of those communication activities.

The emergence of legislative public relations directors, as the creative institute for functional democratic but yet it, has interesting role of government as a "generator" of news.

Concerning with Frederic Dorsett's the best in the early 1960's, the Federal government has definitely expanded its role as a generator of information as contrasted to the more passive role of reporter. The clarification between the two roles is well worth defining if only because it has been and will continue to have tremendous implications for the political communication process. The term "generator" implies the actual creation of "news" and the presence of its dissemination to the media and beyond. The term "reporter" portrays is a person or organization contacted by a media representative for information--in-case-interview being with the latter. The congressional government information officer can and often does function as reporter and generator simultaneously.

Insofar as the Federal government is concerned, the distinction between "generator" and "reporter" is more than a matter of initiative in disseminating information. In generator, the distinctive-tion is power, creating "news" and factors. The reporter is only called for news action or beyond the objective of interesting the

> public. For example, information is often released because it will serve a political purpose or add to the stature of the individual or organization issuing it.[4]

A Wisconsin legislator can benefit both his political party and himself through the communication services provided by the state-paid caucus staffs. Wisconsin's legislators have become "generators" of legislative news in addition to being the traditional "sources" of legislative news as those two terms are defined above.

The legislative leaders agree that the chief target of the Public Information Officer's public relations activities is the individual legislator's constituency. However, different factors often limit what a legislator can do in the way of communication activity. Legislative leaders are in demand as "sources" of legislative news by the media. They tend to receive more press attention and exposure than do other legislators; and, as some of the leaders related, because of this they feel less inclined to avail themselves of the caucus public relations services. Different legislators also represent different media environments. The number and type of media outlets serving a legislator's constituency may affect what caucus staff public relations services a legislator can or cannot use. The media environment from which he comes can affect the communication plan that a legislator develops to keep in contact with his constituents.

Like the Public Information Officers, the legislative leaders argue that the justification for tax support of their partisan communication activities is "informing the public" of governmental

public. For example, testimony in office relevant because it will serve a political purpose or not in the history of the National or organization Energy it.

A Nevada Legislator can benefit both his political party and himself through the communication services provided by the mass-media outlet. Nevada's Legislators have become "governors" of legislative news in addition to being the traditional "sources" of legislative news as those two terms are defined above.

The Legislative Leaders agree that the chief target of the Public Information Officer's public relations activities is the individual Legislator's constituency. However, different reasons often lead each a Legislator was do to its use of communication activity. Legislative Leaders are to demand as "sources" of Legislative news by the media. They want to receive more press attention and exposure from the Legislatures, and, as some of the leaders noted, because of this they feel they have benefited in small measure of the course public relations services. Different Legislators also represent different media environments. The number and type of media which serving a Legislator's constituency may affect the choice that public relations services a Legislator and he-should take. The media environment from which he views and affects the communication plan that a Legislator develops is more in concert with his constituents.

Like the Public Information Officers, the Legislative Leaders agree that the justification for the expense of their personal communication activities is influencing the public of governmental

activity. However, Wisconsin's legislators exhibited an ambivalence toward the governmental public relations function during the past legislative session. While the legislature continued to support its own staffing pattern, and the Public Information Officers included therein, the legislature investigated the practice of public relations within state agencies with an eye to cutting expenditures in that area.[5]

The legislative leaders, again like their information officers, believe that the partisan nature of the communication activities is a strong point of those activities. Besides, the legislators contended that the caucus staffs, through their public relations endeavors, had increased the flow of legislative news reaching the public. The legislators also believed that those activities made a contribution to the state's public information system.

The legislative reporters. The reporters supplied an extra-governmental view of the legislature's emerging public relations function. Because of their "adversary" position in relation to government, the reporters were not convinced of the need for press relations assistance for state legislators. Those reporters who thought that there was a need believed that the need existed for the legislators and not for the press. The reporters felt that the press could operate without such assistance. Most of the sixteen newsmen interviewed in this study indicated that they had little to do with the caucus staff Public Information Officers. But, there was one

activity. However, Kansas's legislature adopted an additional measure the governmental public relations function during the year legislative session. While the legislature neglected to support the educational program, and the Public Information Officer, instead, the legislature investigated the practice of public relations which might somehow interfere with an eye to making suggestions in that area.[7]

The legislative leaders, upon the chief information officers, believe that the positive nature of the communication activities is a strong point of these activities. However, the legislature concluded that the course needs, through their public relations endeavors, and between the time of legislative use, educating the public. The legislature also believed that there existed activities such a contribution to the state's public information program.

The legislative reporters. The reporters replied to educational view of the legislature's employing public relations function. Because of their "adversary" position in relation to government, the reporters were not convinced of the need for press relations assistance for state legislators. Those reporters who thought that there was a need believed that the need existed for the legislators and not for the press. The reporters felt that the press could operate without such assistance. Most of the sixteen reporters interviewed in this study indicated that they did not wish to do with the course about Public Information Officers. But, there was one

notable exception to this. One reporter believed the information officers to be effecting change in the legislator-reporter relationship through an "educational" function. However, this reporter thought that his fellow reporters were not aware of the changes impinging upon that relationship because they were taking place behind the scenes. Newsgathering is a personalized practice of each individual reporter. In the case cited above, the reporter found both the information officers and other caucus staff personnel to be good news sources. Most of the other reporters took the opposite view that the information officers were not good news sources and did not use them as such. The Public Information Officer's value as a news source, apparently, stems from contact between himself and reporters on a personal level, brought about by a reporter's newsgathering initiatives. For the majority of the legislative reporters represented in this study, there exists an uneven awareness of both the function and role of the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers. This uneven awareness dulls the reporters' perceptions of the information officer positions and brings about a less perceptive appreciation of the effects of the publicity efforts of the caucus staffs than one would expect from the reporters. Moreover, the majority of the reporters did not seem to perceive the more subtle manifestations of change being brought about in the legislator-reporter relationship through the Public Information Officer's "educational" activities. Those activities are encouraging legislators to become "generators" (as defined earlier) of news in addition to being mere news "sources." The legislator as "generator"

possible complicies in this. One reporter believed the information officers to be attempting change in the legislator-reporter relationship through an "educational function." However, this reporter thought this failure reporters were not aware of the changes impinging upon such relationships because they were hidden behind the scenes. Investigation is a personalized practice of each individual reporter. In the case cited above, the reporter found both the information officers and other sources quite personal in a good news sources. Most of the other reporters took the opposite view that the information officers were not good news sources and did not use them as such. The Public Information Officer's value as a news source, apparently, rests upon current between closeness and reporters as a personal level, not only about by a reporter's news-seeking initiatives. For the majority of the legislative reporters represented in this study, there exists no serious awareness of both the function and role of the various Public Information officers. This leaves reporters with the reporters' perception of the information officer position and brings about a less perceptive appreciation of the efforts of the politicians effort of the course apart from one could expect from the reporters. However, the activity of the reporters did not seem to provide the more subtle modifications of change being brought about in the legislator-reporter relationship through the Public Information Officer's "educational" activities. These activities are encouraging legislators to become "generators" (as defined earlier) of news in addition to being mere news "sources." The legislator as "generator"

of news advances the concept of information as a power tool for the legislative branch of government, vis-a-vis the executive branch.

Even though reporters claimed that they had little to do with the caucus staff Public Information Officers, they did indicate that some of the caucus staffs' public relations activities were of benefit to them in their reporting. This reveals reporter ambivalence towards the emerging legislative public relations function. While reporters may not approve of or like the idea of such legislative public relations activities they, in fact, find some of these activities helpful to them in newsgathering. In addition, the newsmen thought that the Public Information Officer positions helped rather than hindered them in their legislative newsgathering efforts. The reporters, generally, did not consider the information officers to be "barriers" to news coverage of the legislature. Nor did the reporters believe, in most cases, that the information officers' activities infringed upon their own newsgathering efforts.

The newsmen believed the chief target of the legislators' public relations efforts to be the local constituencies. Unlike the Public Information Officers and the legislative leaders, the reporters believed that the legislative leadership benefitted from the legislative public relations activities (see Table 5.1). As "adversaries" to such activities, the newsmen questioned the expenditure of tax monies in support of the caucus staffs' public relations endeavors. But, the reporters were almost unanimous in the belief that those activities had increased the flow of legislative news reaching the

public, a development borne out in this study. The reporters also believed that the legislative public relations activities were making a contribution to the state's public information system.

Categorizing a Week's Legislative News

A categorization of seven hundred fifty-four news articles mentioning legislative activity or individual legislators gathered from both Wisconsin daily and weekly papers revealed that at least seventeen percent of those items were originated by legislators themselves, or in their behalf by staff personnel. This categorization does not depict how other legislative news items might have, in fact, stemmed from caucus staff releases or tips. Yet, the caucus press releases, as discussed earlier, are often used by reporters in those ways. This categorization indicates that news articles "generated" by legislators are a part of the print media's coverage of state level legislative activity. The impact of the legislative public relations activities upon the state's electronic media remains to be determined.

Wisconsin's Public Information System

The other four study objectives so far summarized in this section make more explicit one of the several elements constituting the state's public information system, that system by which a person learns of the activity of his state government. The legislature's caucus staffs, through their Public Information Officers, have established themselves as contributing elements in Wisconsin's

public, a conclusion borne out in this study. The important elements that the legislative public relations activities were making a contribution to the state's public information system.

Characterizing a state's legislative news

A categorization of news bureaus fully-free news releases emanating legislative activity or individual legislators gathered from both statewide daily and weekly papers revealed that at least seventeen percent of these items were originated by legislators themselves, or in their behalf by staff personnel. This categorization does not depict how active legislative news items might have, in fact, dominated the content of daily newspapers or ships. Yet, the source point indicates, to journalist media, are often used by reporters in their copy. This categorization indicates that news articles "generated" by legislators are a part of the print media's coverage of state level legislative activity. The impact of the legislative public relations activities upon the state's electronic media remains to be determined.

Statutory Public Information System

The other five study objectives so far mentioned in this section make some suggests one of the original planners conceptualizing the society's public information system, that system by which a person learns of the activity of his state government. The legislature's owners staff, through their Public Information Officers, have established liaisons to monitoring elements in Tennessee's

public information system. In so doing, those staffs have moved alongside the privately-owned media within the state, and also, alongside other state-originated public relations efforts feeding the information system. The citizens dependent upon the state's public information system for news of state governmental activity may more accurately evaluate that activity if they attempt to know and evaluate the "generating" elements involved in that system.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Legislators, on both the national and state level, are giving increasing attention to the concept of information policy as a power tool in their day-to-day activities. The emergence of legislative public relations programs reflects this interest. The vocal nature of politics will continue to grow in complexity as more and more minority points of view are articulated in the arena of public opinion. As this occurs, the ability to communicate, to persuade, to respond and answer (basic prerequisites of political life) will become even more important keys in the future political survival of politicians.

In their Effective Public Relations, Cutlip and Center state that:

> . . . The mass media of press, magazine, radio, television, and motion pictures have become the common carriers of decision-making information.[6]

It is because of that fact that elected officials, as well as others, are showing increased concern in their relations with the mass media. Officials are aware that the restrictive nature of the mass media--

public information systems. In no doubt, some state's have moved inadequately low technology-based media outlets low stress, and look, although some state-originated public information activities freeing the information system. The citizens dependent upon the state's public information system for more of state governmental activity may have successfully evaluate that activity if they attempt to use and evaluate the "gatekeeping" mechanism involved in that system.

Implications of the study

Legislatures, on both the national and state level, are giving increasing attention to the concept of information policy as a power tool in their day-to-day activities. The emergence of legislative public relations programs reflects this tendency. The varied nature of legislative will continue to grow in complexity as more and more minority groups of state are introduced in the realm of public opinion. In this course, the ability to communicate, to persuade, to respond and answer (media personalities of political life) will become even more important keys in the future political environment of politicians.

In their effective public relations, Smith and Chafee state that

> . . . the more media of press, magazine, radio, television, and motion pictures have become the common medium of expression, public information.*

It is because of that fact that more effective officials, as well as those, who seeking different channels to deliver relationships with the mass media, officials are aware that the institutions leaders of the mass media--

their limited space and time, their "gatekeeper" or access controlling function--confronts those who would attempt to use the mass media with many problems. The evolution of public relations has provided a partial answer to some of these problems. Individuals or organizations who seek to transmit decision-making information to the public through the mass media have discovered that public relations techniques can give them an edge in the competition for media space/time. They have also discovered that public relations techniques can give them an edge in the competition for the public's attention to messages transmitted via the mass media. Public officials, on all levels and in all branches of American government, are becoming more aggressive in "generating" news for political purposes through the use of public relations techniques. This trend shows signs of enlarging in the future.

Stanley Kelley, Jr., has written:

> It is clear that the public relations program not only does something to the public at whom it is directed, but also to the organization which sponsors it.[7]

In Wisconsin's Legislature, the changes so far brought about by the emerging legislative public relations function have been somewhat imperceptible. Nevertheless, changes have occurred and there is every reason to expect that other changes may follow. So far, legislative activity, because of aggressive use of publicity by legislators, is receiving greater media exposure now than before the creation of the caucus staffs. Hence, legislative activity is becoming more open to the public view than previously. So it can

Lobbyist Lobbyist speaks and then, finally "grassroots" or issues manipulation—activists based who would challenge in the room begin with some questions. This evolution of public relations has provided a partial answer to some of these problems. Individuals or organizations who seek to influence decision-making information to the public through the mass media have discovered that public relations techniques can give them an edge in the competition for media space/time. They have also discovered that public relations techniques can give them an edge in the competition for their positions to manipulate issues-oriented with the mass media. Public officials, as all levels and in all branches of American government, are becoming more aggressive in "giving-in-kind" case their political purposes through the use of public relations techniques. This trend seems alive of "lobbying in the future.

Stanley Kelley, Jr., has written:

> In an effort with the public relations programs not only does something to the public as such it is directed, but also to the organizations other agencies it.

In Minnesota's legislature, the stages is far strong about by the media. Legislators public relations Tactics that have assumed importance. Interviews, charge have sometimes are there is every reason to expect that more changes are coming. In fact, legislative activity, because of expansion use of publicity in legislatures, is receiving greater media scrutiny and also before the attention of the media media. Thus, legislative activity is becoming more open to the public than ever previously. As is the

be argued that the increased visibility of the legislative process is at least enabling the public to make more accurate appraisals of legislative performance; that is, if the public is attentive to the available mass media messages. At the other extreme, as the late V. O. Key expressed it: "Without receiving a copious flow of information, the constituency can exercise no electoral sanction against the errant legislator."[8] "High profile" legislators, as one legislator interviewed in this study put it, may possibly make for an improved legislative process.

The Wisconsin Legislature and its members may be moving closer to the public it was instituted to serve by undertaking continuous meaningful communication with that public through the public relations activities of the caucus staffs. This study has shown that more messages on legislative activity are available now in Wisconsin's print media than there were before the caucus staffs embarked upon public relations activities for legislators. The increase in the number of available legislative messages and the caucus staffs' move into public relations activities are related. Only a separate and detailed study can determine if those messages generated by the caucuses' public relations efforts are, in fact, meaningful messages and not merely publicity puffs or tax-paid propaganda. This author believes that a significant portion of those messages are meaningful. That opinion may be partially supported by this study's finding that the state's print media utilize, in varying degrees, those generated messages in reporting state

legislative news. But, as evidenced by the normal attrition rate of many of the caucus staffs' generated messages, some are not meaningful enough to win access to the communication channels in direct competition with other items. The Public Information Officers interviewed for this study related that they were trying to do away with the generation of meaningless messages in their activities. They acknowledged, in their opinion, that some such messages were being disseminated at the request of individual legislators.

It is difficult at this time to pinpoint specific negative results being brought about by Wisconsin's evolving legislative public relations function, mainly because of the imperceptibility of the changes emanating from that function. Yet, it is still possible, even if only in a generalized way, to consider some such negative results which might possibly occur. One such possible result, which occasionally arises when a communication consciousness dominates the decision-making process, is: decisions may be made primarily for their communication value and not necessarily for their intrinsic correctness. Another potentially negative effect of the emerging legislative public relations function involves the debasement of communication between the legislature and the public. Erroneous or misleading messages communicated to the public through the legislature's public relations activities can confuse the public's understanding of an item or issue in public debate. Precisely because of these and other potentially negative results of the legislature's public relations function, the interest shown by

Wisconsin's and other state legislatures in the public relations function ought to be carefully watched. It is the public which is ultimately affected by governmental efforts in the agressive use of information as a political power tool.

Wisconsin's Legislators may move away from the public which bestows their authority by debasing the public dialogue through the "generation" of insignificant, erroneous, or misleading messages. Furthermore, the legislators may, as a result of their emphasis upon the public relations function, begin to insulate themselves from the scrutiny of newsmen. Legislators might be tempted to hide behind their staffs so as to protect themselves from being caught "unaware," "unprepared," or "unrehearsed" by reporters seeking news. Legislators might be motivated to do this in order to better control the "images" of themselves transmitted to the public by the press. Legislators are caught up in a pervasive concern about their "images" and the "image" of the legislature. Many legislators are convinced that their "images" are directly related to their chances for political survival. The concern over "image" can breed a lessening of frank, open communication in favor of measured communication undertaken when of advantage to the legislator.

Wisconsin's legislative public relations function marks an overt attempt by the state legislature to confront the executive branch of state government in the public relations/communication field. Moreover, Wisconsin's example typifies similar thrusts by other state legislatures to do the same. The goal in those efforts

Wisconsin's and other state legislatures in the public relations function cannot be overlooked methods. It is the public which is ultimately affected by governmental efforts to the appropriate use of information as a political power tool.

Wisconsin's legislature may gain away from the public which feelings their authority to demand the public citizens through the "government" of legislation, arrogance, or misleading measures. Furthermore, the legislature may, as a result of their negligence upon the public relations function, begin to insulate themselves from the scrutiny of lawmaker. Legislators might be tempted to hide behind their office as to protect themselves from being caught "wrong," "misguided," or "misleadered" by constituents seeking gains. Legislators must be motivated to do this in order to better control the "image" of themselves communicated to the public by the media. Legislators are caught up in a particular manner about their "image" and the "image" of the legislature. They legislators are concerned that their "image" are directly related to their chances for political survival. The concern over "image" can lead a legislator of truly open communication in favor of measured communication behaviors when of advantage to the legislator.

Wisconsin's legislative public relations function merits an more attempt by the state legislature to conform the measure reason of state government in the public relations/communication field. Therefore, Wisconsin's complex legislative structure forces other state legislatures to do the same. The goal is strong efforts

is to counter the gains made by the executive branch of government in the struggle for the balance of power in the governing process; some of those gains having been made through the executive's skillful use of public relations.

Newsmen, in their roles as the public's observers of the daily conduct of governmental business, must concern themselves with the growing sophistication of government in the use of information as a power tool. The media must be quick to discern new trends in that area, such as the emerging legislative interest (both at the national and state levels) in the public relations function. The news media have an obligation to the public to make the public aware of how news, in this case governmental news, is "generated." The media will not be able to do this unless they have an appreciation of what is transpiring in that area on a daily basis. This study reveals that the majority of the legislative reporters interviewed lacked awareness of both the function and role of the caucus staffs' Public Information Officers. Moreover, most of the reporters had not given much thought as to how the caucus staffs' public relations activities might affect newsgathering at the state legislature. They should give some thought to that question. Otherwise, they stand a chance of being used unwittingly by politicians implementing personal political communication game plans.

The media may have contributed to the rise of information as a power tool. Traditional news values emphasize the negative, the conflictful. Those individuals interested in using the media for

is to consider this issue with the economic freedom of government to the extension the freedom of power in the governing process over of these policy having been made through the commercial-political use of public relations.

However, in their roles as the political elements of the daily economy of governmental functions, such economic consideration such the crucial implications of government in the use of information as a power tool. The media must be quick to discern how trends in that area, such as the emerging Intellektual Industrial Complex, of the national and state levels in the public relations functions. The media should use as obligations in the world to make the public aware of the news, in this case governmental power, in "government." The media will not be able to do this because their ties to applications of what is considered in their own as a daily basis. This proof reveals that the authority of the legislative regulatory subsystem limits consumers of their rights protection and role of the mass media's Public Information Offices. However, some of the regulations and our given such thought as to use the media effectively public relations activities might effect manipulations as the mass legislations. They should give some thought to that question. Otherwise, they might a chance of being used unwillingly by politicians businesses(by personal political communication plan plans).

The media may have contributed to the view of information as a power tool. Traditional news values implicate the regulatory, the constitutional. These knowledge information to making the media fun-

political reasons have learned how to gain media coverage by formulating messages or activities which bring out the negative, the conflictful, the sensational. In addition, those same individuals have recognized that the media because of a lack of manpower brought on by limited financial resources cannot cover all the news. So they have found that the media, in many cases, are willing to use news handouts in their attempts to cover the news. The media are the channels to the public; and, the public is the channel to power for those men seeking power. Men seeking power have learned, and continue to learn, how they can use the media in their quest. Perhaps some overhaul of the news business might be required to stem the use, by government, of information as a force for achieving political ends. Politics is the business of a free people governing themselves.

FOOTNOTES FOR CHAPTER 7

[1]Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations, Fourth Edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 105.

[2]See Stanley Kelley, Jr.'s, Professional Public Relations And Political Power (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956); and, Dan Nimmo's, The Political Persuaders (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

[3]Midwest Public Relations Conference, Public Relations, Politics/Government And The Public Interest (Madison, Wisconsin: University Extension, The University of Wisconsin, 1969), p. 56.

[4]American Institute For Political Communication, The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship (Washington, D.C.: American Institute For Political Communication, 1966), p. 27.

[5]See Footnote 7 for Chapter 5.

[6]Cutlip and Center, Effective Public Relations, p. 120.

[7]Kelley, Professional Public Relations And Political Power, pp. 21-22.

[8]V. O. Key, Jr., Public Opinion And American Democracy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), p. 494.

FOOTNOTES FOR PARTS I

[1]Scott R. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations, Fourth Edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 105.

[2]Jim Hunter Bailey, Jr.'s, Professional Public Relations and Political Power (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), and Jim Lowe's, The Political Propaganda (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

[3]Robert Tonle Bowlinus Dorchester, Public Relations, Publicity/Government and The Public Interest (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, The University of Cambridge, 1969), p. 73.

[4]American Institute for Political Communication, The Federal Government Public Relations Handbook (Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Political Communication, 1980), p. 27.

[5]See Footnote 1 for Chapter 3.

[6]Cutlip and Center, Effective Public Relations, p. 104.

[7]Bailey, Professional Public Relations and Political Power, pp. 21-22.

[8]J. D. Ray, Jr., Public Opinion and Modern Democracy (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 1.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Institute For Political Communication. The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship. Washington, D.C.: American Institute For Political Communication, 1966.

Bordes, George R. Friendly Adversaries: The Press And Government. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Center for the Study of the American Press, Marquette University College of Journalism, 1969.

Burns, John. The Sometime Governments. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Cater, Douglass. The Fourth Branch Of Government. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959.

Chartock, Alan S., and Max Berking. Strengthening The Wisconsin Legislature An Eagleton Study And Report. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1970.

Cohen, Bernard C. The Press and Foreign Policy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Cutlip, Scott M., and Allen H. Center. Effective Public Relations. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Dunn, Delmer Delano. Public Officials and the Press. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Epstein, Leon D. Politics in Wisconsin. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

Greene, Lee S., Malcolm E. Jewell, and Daniel R. Grant. The State And The Metropolis. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1968.

Heard, Alexander (ed.). State Legislatures In American Politics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Hedlund, Ronald D., and Wilder Crane, Jr. The Job of The Wisconsin Legislator. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 1971.

Hiebert, Ray Eldon (ed.). The Press In Washington. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1966.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Institute for Political Communication. The Federal Government-Daily Press Relationship. Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Political Communication, 1968.

Barnes, George E. Friendly Adversaries: The Press and Government. Minneapolis: Minnesota Center for the Study of the Democratic Press, Minneapolis University College of Journalism, 1960.

Barron, John. The Liberties Guarantee. New York: Random House, 1971.

Cohen, Bernard. The Public Mind of Government. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

Crawford, Alan G., and Max Berkley. Strengthening the Statewide Legislature: An Implied Study for New Jersey. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1971.

Cohen, Bernard C. The Press and Foreign Policy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Cutlip, Scott M., and Allen H. Center. Effective Public Relations. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Dunn, Delmer Dennis. Public Officials and the Press. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Epstein, Leon D. Politics in Wisconsin. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

Greene, Lee S., Marvin E. Gesell, and Daniel H. Green. The State and the Taxpayer. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1960.

Harris, Alexander (ed.). State Legislatures in American Politics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Holland, Ronald F., and Allen Cross, Jr. The Job of the Wisconsin Legislator. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 1972.

Hulteng, Jay Black (ed.). The Press in Washington. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1966.

Jewell, Malcolm E., and Samuel C. Patterson. The Legislative Process In the United States. New York: Random House, 1966.

Kelley, Stanley, Jr. Professional Public Relations And Political Power. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.

Key, V. O., Jr. Public Opinion And American Democracy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Lee, Richard W. (ed.). Politics And The Press. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1970.

Lippmann, Walter. Public Opinion. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Matthews, Donald R. U.S. Senators And Their World. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.

McCamy, James L. Government Publicity Its Practice In Federal Administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Mimmo, Dan D. Newsgathering In Washington. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

_____. The Political Persuaders. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Pimlott, J. A. R. Public Relations And American Democracy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951.

Reston, James. The Artillery Of The Press. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Rivers, William. The Opinion Makers. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.

_____. The Adversaries. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

Robson, William A. The Governors and the Governed. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964.

Rosten, Leo C. The Washington Correspondents. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937.

Rourke, Francis E. Secrecy And Publicity: Dilemmas Of Democracy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961.

Sellitz, Claire, and others. Research Methods In Social Relations. Revised Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Jewell, Malcolm E., and Samuel C. Patterson. The Legislative Process in the United States. New York: Random House, 1966.

Kelley, Stanley, Jr. Professional Public Relations and Political Power. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.

Key, V. O., Jr. Public Opinion and American Democracy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Lee, Alfred M., (ed.). Multivariate Analysis. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Book, 1970.

Lippmann, Walter. Public Opinion. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Robinson, Donald E. U.S. Politics and Public Policy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969.

Rufer, James L. Government Publicity: Its Problems In Peacetime Administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Simon, Sen S. Communication in Washington. New York: Atherton Press, 1968.

_____. The Political Reporter. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Stokes, A. G. Public Relations and American Democracy. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1951.

Swanson, James. The Art/Craft of the Press. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Steven, William. The Opinion Gap. Belmont: Duxbury Press, 1968.

_____. The Legislative. Belmont: Duxbury Press, 1970.

Tebbel, William A. The Governors and the Governed. London: Pergamon Alien and Unwin Ltd., 1968.

Weaver, Dan C. The Washington Correspondents. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1971.

Rourke, Francis E. Secrecy and Publicity: Dilemmas of Democracy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961.

Sellitz, Claire, and others. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Tacheron, Donald G., and Morris K. Udall. The Job Of The Congressman An Introduction To Service In The U.S. House Of Representatives. 2nd ed. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1970.

Wahlke, John C., and others. The Legislative System Explorations In Legislative Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Wilson, Charles. Parliaments, Peoples And Mass Media. London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1970.

Zeller, Belle (ed.). American State Legislatures. New York: Thomasy-Crowell Co., 1954.

Articles and Periodicals

Bateman, J. Carroll. "Techniques of Managing the News," Public Relations Journal, August, 1963, 6-9.

Beetle, David H. "Legislatures: The 100-Year Lag," The Nation, November 7, 1966, 475-478.

Capital Times [Madison], June 8, 1971.

_____. July 8, 1971.

Columbia Journalism Review, "The Ten Least Reported Stories," 8, No. 4 (Winter, 1969-1970), 2.

Fitzpatrick, Dick. "Public Information Activities of Government Agencies," Public Opinion Quarterly, 11 (Winter, 1947), 530-539.

Garcia, Arthur. "A Study of the Opinions and Attitudes of California's Capital Correspondents," Journalism Quarterly, 44, No. 3 (Summer, 1967), 330-333.

Hoffman, Paul. "The Neglected Statehouse," Columbia Journalism Review, 6, No. 3 (Summer, 1967), 21-24.

Keir, Gerald J. "Government Public Relations and the Press in Michigan," Journalism Quarterly, 43, No. 3 (Autumn, 1966), 551-552.

Krock, Arthur. "Press vs. Government--A Warning," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1 (Spring, 1937), 45-49.

Mader, Joseph H. "Government Press Bureaus And Reporting of Public Affairs," Journalism Quarterly, 19, No. 2 (June, 1942), 172-178.

Tankersley, Donald G., and Edwin E. Wall. The Art of the Interviewer: An Introduction to Service in the Field Office of Employment Security. 2nd ed. New York: Ronald-Harrell Co., 1970.

Weller, John C., and others. The Legislative Review Implementation in Legislative Bureaus. New York: John Gray and Sons, 1968.

Wilson, Charles. Multimedia, Design and Mass Media. London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1971.

Zelin, Edwin (ed.). Reviews Data Legislation. New York: Thomas-Crowell Co., 1970.

Articles and Periodicals

Bateman, J. Carroll. "Techniques of Keeping the News." Public Relations Journal, August, 1973, 4-6.

Berlin, Lewis H. "Legislatures, The 120-Year Leg." The Editor, November 7, 1969, 127-139.

Capital Times (Madison), June 8, 1971.

_____. May 8, 1971.

Columbia Journalism Review. "The Ten Least Reported Stories." 8, no. 6 (Summer, 1969-1970), 6.

Fitzpatrick, John. "Public Information Activities of Government Agencies." Public Opinion Quarterly, 11 (Winter, 1947), 537-539.

Garcia, Arturo. "A Study of the Opinions and Attitudes of California's Control Correspondents." Journalism Quarterly 41, No. 3 (Summer, 1967), 323-331.

Gottlieb, Saul. "The Business Business." Business Journalism Review, 6, No. 1 (Summer, 1967), 21-27.

Kaiser, Kenneth J. "Newspaper Public Relations and the Press in Education." Journalism Quarterly 47, No. 3 (Autumn, 1970), 599-604.

Lowe, Arthur. "Press vs. Government--a review." Public Opinion Quarterly 1 (Spring, 1937), 127-4.

Meier, Joseph E. "Government Press Releases and Reporting of Public Affairs." Journalism Quarterly 17, No. 2 (June, 1940), 172-179.

McCartney, James. "The Great Handout Society," The Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, October, 1967, 1, 16.

Merwin, Fred E. "Public Relations and the State Government," Journalism Quarterly, 14, No. 4 (December, 1937), 342-352.

Milwaukee Journal, July 7, 1971.

Rosenthal, Alan. "An Analysis Of Institutional Effects: Staffing Legislative Parties In Wisconsin," Journal of Politics, 32 (August, 1970), 531-562.

Toepel, M. G. "Public Relations: Complex Government Requires A Comprehensive Program To Keep Citizens Fully Informed," Municipality, October, 1950, 220, 234-239.

Wilhoit, G. Cleveland, and Kenneth S. Sherill. "Wire Service Visibility of U.S. Senators," Journalism Quarterly, 45, No. 1 (Spring, 1968), 42-48.

Reports, Brochures and Yearbooks

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Modernizing State Government. 1967.

Citizens Conference on State Legislatures. "On Behalf of State Legislatures," Brochure. Kansas City, Missouri: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, undated.

_____. Report on an Evaluation of the 50 State Legislatures. Kansas City, Missouri: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, 1971.

Kunnerth, William F., and J. K. Hvistendahl. Iowa Legislators' Evaluation Of The Press Sixty-Third General Session (First Session). Ames, Iowa: Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, 1970.

Legislative Reference Bureau. The Legislative Reference Bureau Can Help You, Informational Bulletin 70-6. Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Reference Bureau, 1970.

Midwest Public Relations Conference. Public Relations, Politics/Government And The Public Interest. Madison, Wisconsin: University Extension, University of Wisconsin, 1969.

National Conference of State Legislative Leaders. Brochure. Milwaukee: National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, undated.

McKeiver, James. "The Grand Rapids Society." The Politics of the American Judicial of Newspaper Editors. Victor, 1971, p. 10.

Morris, Fred C. "Public Relations and the Ohio Government." Journal Quarterly, 34, No. 4 (December, 1973), 342-352.

Kilgrove Journal, July 7, 1973.

Hammond, Alan. "An Analysis of Institutional Effects: Electing Legislative Parties in Wisconsin." Journal of Politics, 32 (August, 1970), 532-542.

Thomas, R. G. "Public Relations: Chapter Government Begins A Comprehensive Program to Keep Citizens Fully Informed." Municipality, October, 1970, 203, 234-239.

Wallace, G. Hammond, and Edward S. Morris. "The Service Visibility of U.S. Executive." Journalism Quarterly, 47, No. 1 (Spring, 1967), 10-42.

Reports, Brochures and Pamphlets

Center of Congress of the United States. Informing State Government. 1967.

Citizens Conference on State Legislatures. "On Behalf of State Legislatures." Brochure. Kansas City, Missouri: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, Summer.

_____. Report on an Evaluation of the 50 State Legislatures. Kansas City, Missouri: Citizens Conference on State Legislatures, 1971.

Kneeland, Gilliam Z., and A. E. Brisenhood. Iowa Legislature: Patterns of the Four Sixty-Third General Assembly (First Session). Ames, Iowa: Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, 1970.

Legislative Reference Bureau. The Legislative Reference Bureau Can Help You. Informational Bulletin (Pm). Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Reference Bureau, 1970.

Midwest Public Relations Conference. Public Relations, Politics, Government and the Media Jungle. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Extension, University of Wisconsin, 1970.

National Conference of State Legislative Leaders. Brochure. Philadelphia: National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, undated.

_____. Report of Third National Conference of State Legislative Leaders. Carson City, Nevada: National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1961.

_____. Yearbook of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Number 3. Milwaukee: Office of the Secretariat, National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1968.

_____. Yearbook of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Number 4. Milwaukee: Office of the Secretariat, National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1969.

National Legislative Conference. Mr. President ... Mr. Speaker, Report of the Committee on Organization of Legislative Services of the National Legislative Conference. Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1963.

_____. Summary of Proceedings Twenty-Third Annual Meeting. Atlanta: Council of State Governments, 1970.

Unpublished Materials

Donoghue, James R. "The Legislature," Chapter Four of The Basis of Government. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Extension, Institute of Governmental Affairs, undated.

Dunn, Delmer Delano. "Interaction Between The Press And Wisconsin State Officials." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Moon, Gordon Ames, II. "James Campbell Hagerty's Eight Years in the Whitehouse." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Rosenthal, Alan. "Professional Staff and Legislative Strength: The Case of Wisconsin." Manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Robison, September, 1969.

Strole, Douglas Luther. "Newsgathering At The Pentagon." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Wade, Warren Rockwood. "The Adequacy of Legislative Staffing In The Wisconsin Legislature." A research paper submitted in lieu of a thesis for the Master's degree, University of Wisconsin, 1968.

_____. Report of First National Conference of State Legislative Leaders. Kansas City, Missouri: National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1961.

_____. Proceedings of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Number 1. Minneapolis: Office of the Secretary, National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1966.

_____. Proceedings of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Number 2. Minneapolis: Office of the Secretary, National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, 1967.

National Legislative Conference. Mr. President ..., Mr. Speaker: Report of the Committee on Organization of Legislative Services of the National Legislative Conference. Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1967.

_____. Summary of Proceedings Twenty-Third Annual Meeting. Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1971.

Unpublished Materials

Boodgers, James R. "The Legislature." Course Text of The Basis of Government. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Extension, Institute of Governmental Affairs, mimeo.

Lee, Daniel Edson. "Interaction Between the First and Eleventh State Officials." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Moss, Frank Jon, Jr. "Some Congressional Staffing Since Then in the Mainstream." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Rosenthal, Alan. "Professional Staff and Legislative Oversight: The Case of Wisconsin." Manuscript prepared for "The Politics and Consequences of Legislative Change," edited by James Jackson, November, 1980.

Shrole, Dwayne Lamar. "Congressional Staffing in the Seventies." Undergraduate Master's thesis, University of Illinois, 1971.

Wade, Carlton Dodgood. "The Adequacy of Legislative Staffing in the Wisconsin Legislature." A research paper submitted in lieu of a thesis for the Master's degree, University of Wisconsin, 1968.

Wisconsin Public Documents

Committee on Legislative Organization and Procedure. The Wisconsin Study Third Report. Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Council, 1965.

Legislative Programs Study Committee. The Wisconsin Study Fourth Report. Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Council, 1969.

Wisconsin Blue Book 1970. Madison, Wisconsin: Document Sales, 1970.

Wisconsin. Senate Journal, Eightieth Session. May 27, 1971.

Wisconsin. Session Laws. (1967).

Wisconsin. Senate Payroll. (1968).

Other Sources

Madison, Wisconsin. Personal Interviews with four caucus staff Public Information Officers, seven legislative leaders, and sixteen legislative reporters.

Eagleton Institute of Politics. Personal correspondence between Dr. Alan Rosenthal and the writer, September, 23, 1971.

National Legislative Conference. Personal correspondence between Mr. Ed Crane, Secretary of the National Legislative Conference, and the writer, May 6, 1971.

_____. Memorandum to the Members of the Executive Committee National Legislative Conference from Mr. Ed Crane, Secretary National Legislative Conference, April 16, 1971.

Wisconsin Public Documents

Committee on Legislative Organization and Procedure. The Wisconsin Study Trial Report. Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Council, 1970.

Legislative Program Study Committee. The Wisconsin Study Trial Report. Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Council, 1970.

Wisconsin Blue Book 1971. Madison, Wisconsin: Document Sales, 1971.

Wisconsin. Senate Journal. Eighties Session. May 27, 1971.

Wisconsin. Session Laws. (1969).

Wisconsin. Senate Journal. (1969).

Other Sources

Mullen, Bonnie. Personal Interviews with Jim Jones about what Public Information Officers, News Legislative Leaders, and Assembly Legislative reporters.

Legislative Services of Minnesota. Personal correspondence between Mr. Alan Rosenthal and the writer, September 27, 1971.

National Legislative Conference. Personal correspondence between Mr. Ed Grant, Director of the National Legislative Conference, and the author, May 5, 1971.

_____. Interviews of the leaders of the Minnesota Conference National Legislative Conference from Mr. Ed Grant, Executive National Legislative Conference, April 14, 1971.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

The following lists of questions were used in the focused interviews conducted during this research. Not all questions were asked all respondents. Questions were not always phrased as shown since the object of the interview was to create a conversational atmosphere conducive to eliciting the respondents' opinions.

QUESTIONS ASKED LEGISLATORS

Do legislators try to use the press? Why? For what purposes? What techniques do they use? What prompted the caucus staffs to move into public relations activities? Why are the public relations activities of the caucus staffs necessary? What basic function is the Public Information Officer supposed to perform for the caucus member? How do the public relations/communication activities of the caucus staff help the legislator in the performance of his job as a legislator? How important is communication with constituents through the mass media to the individual legislator? What role, if any, do the caucus staff public relations activities play in the formation of public opinion on legislative issues and/or personalities? Do legislators rely upon reporters or upon the caucus Public Information Officer for advice on press relations? How much influence do the respective Public Information Officers have with the legislators of their caucus? Does the caucus leadership make any attempt to

APPENDIX

The following lists of questions were used in the focused interviews conducted during this research. Not all questions were asked all respondents. Questions more out starter questions as shown above the object of the interview was to create a conversational atmosphere conducive to eliciting the respondents' opinions.

QUESTIONS ASKED LEGISLATORS

In legislators try to see the press. Why? For what purposes? Your questions do they ask? Have you engaged the media staffs to some time public relations activities? Why are the public relations activities of the census media assessment? What needs direction in the Public Information Officer responsible in politics for the census member? How do the public relations/communications activities of the census staff help the legislator in the performance of his job as a legislator? Has cooperation in communication with constituents through the media helped in the individual legislator? What role, if any, do the census staff public relations activities play in the formation of public opinion on legislative issues and/or personalities? Do legislators rely upon reporters or upon the census Public Information Officer for advice on press relations? Has much influence do the respective Public Information Officers have with the legislators of their district? Does the census locally-elected role may attempt to

educate caucus members in press relations? If so, what is done?

QUESTIONS ASKED PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS

What information and/or public relations activities does the Public Information Officer undertake for legislators? Who bears the cost of those activities? Why are the public relations activities of the caucus staff necessary? What specific function is the press failing to perform that the Public Information Officer operation is trying to fill? What percentage of the caucus staff time is given to the performance of the public relations activities? In what ways, if any, do the public relations activities of the caucus staff directly affect the capital press corps reporter? If those activities do not affect the capital press corps reporter, then who do they affect? Are legislators availing themselves of the public relations assistance furnished by the caucus staff? What relationships are important for the Public Information Officer in the successful completion of his tasks? Do the Public Information Officers attempt to assay the effects of their information activities? If so, how?

QUESTIONS ASKED NEWSMEN

What are you trying to do in your work? Have the Public Information Officer positions in the caucuses done anything to affect the normal intimate type contact of legislators and reporters? How much or how little of reporter and legislator interaction is channeled through the Public Information Officer? What benefit, if any, does the

educate course members in press relations? If so, what is done?

OPERATING AGENCY PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS

Our information and/or public relations personnel are the Public Information officer assigned for legislative? Who bears the cost of these activities? Why are the public relations activities of the agency what? What specific function is the press failing to perform that the Public Information officer operation is trying to fill? What percentage of the amount that is given to the publication of the public relations activities? In what way, if any, do the public relations activities of the agency affect directly affect the capital press corps reporter? If these activities do not affect the capital press corps reporter, then why do they affect? Are legislators availing themselves of the public relations assistance furnished by the agency staff? What relationships are important for the Public Information officer in the successful completion of his tasks? Do the Public Information officers attempt to assay the efforts of lower information activities? If so, how?

QUESTIONS ASKED SENATOR

What are you trying to do in your work? Does the Public Information officer position in the agencies does supplying to actual the annual intimate type contact of legislative and reporters? Do such as his title of reporter and legislator interaction is transmitted through the Public Information officer? Does benefit, if any, does the

reporter gain from the Public Information Officer operation? What is the feeling of the press corps as a whole concerning the caucus Public Information Officers and the public relations activities of the caucus staffs? Are the Public Information Officers in any way valuable as news sources? Do the Public Information Officer positions have any effect at all upon the capital press corps reporter? Has the establishment of the Public Information Officer positions and the movement of the caucus staff into public relations type activity affected news dissemination from legislators to reporters? If so, how? Have the Public Information Officers affected media coverage of the legislature? Is the Public Information Officer a barrier to news coverage of the legislature? Why, or why not? Do the Public Information Officer positions help or hinder the reporter in covering the state legislature? In what ways? Has the gathering of legislative news become easier or more difficult since the establishment of the Public Information Officer positions within the caucus staffs? What major discrepancy exists between your definition of news and the definition of news relied upon by the legislators and their information officers? Are caucus press releases valuable to you in your newsgathering efforts? Are news conferences good opportunities to obtain news? Do legislators exhibit more hesitancy or less hesitancy now in dealing with the press corps than prior to the creation of the information officer positions? Has the accessibility of legislators changed since the creation of the information officer positions? What are your complaints against the information officers and their public relations activities, if any? How accessible are the information officers to reporters? Are the

reporter pulls from the Public Information Officer operations? Then is the funding of the press scope as a whole concerning the course Public Information Officers and the public relations activities of the course itself? Are the Public Information Officers in any way violable as news sources? Do the Public Information Officer positions have any effect at all upon the capital press corps reporters? Has the motivation of the Public Information Officer positions and the appearance of the course what? Has public relations type activity affected news dissemination from legislators to reporters? If so, how? Does the Public Information Officers affected media coverage of the legislature? Is the Public Information Officer a barrier or does coverage of the legislature? Why, or why not? Do the Public Information Officer positions help or hinder the reporter in covering the state legislature? In what ways? Has the gatekeeping of legislators been easier or more difficult since the establishment of the Public Information Officer positions within the course staff? What major controversy exists between your institution or some sort the institution of press relied upon by the legislators and their Information officers? Are course press releases valuable to you in your newsgathering efforts? Are news conferences good opportunities to obtain news? Do legislators exhibit more hesitancy or have hesitancy now in dealing with the press except been prior to the creation of the Information Officer positions? Has the accessibility of legislators changed since the creation of the Information Officer positions? What are your complaints against the Information Officers and their public relations activities, if any? How accessible are the Information officers to reporters? Are the

information officers technically competent in the performance of their jobs? How often do you go to either a caucus staffer or to an information officer for the purpose of gathering the news? Are legislators becoming more adept in their efforts at dealing with the press? What part do you play in the system by which a citizen learns of the actions of his state government?

QUESTIONS ASKED ALL THREE GROUPS

Is there a need for press relations assistance on behalf of state legislators? Why, or why not? Is there a need for the caucus staff information officer as he operates now with his public relations activities? Does the information officer influence the news of the legislature and/or legislators which is disseminated to the public? What effect have the information officers had upon the flow of news from legislators to the public through the press? Is the Public Information Officer an effective channel for the legislator who desires to transmit information to constituents through the press? How essential are the information officers in the transmission of information about legislators and the business of the legislature to the public via the media? Are there areas of over or under emphasis in the type of news originating from the caucus staffs' news efforts? Where does the caucus staff and the Public Information Officer exert the greatest information effort? What audience is the chief target of the information activities? Does any one class or type of legislator derive the greatest benefit from the caucus-originated public

Information officers responsibility exceptional in the performance of their job? How often do you go to attend a course studies or to an information officer for the purpose of producing the media? Are legislators becoming more adept in their efforts at dealing with the press? What part do you play in the process by which a citizen learns of his actions of the state government?

Questions about the press conference

Is there a need for press relations assistance on behalf of state legislators? Why, or why not? Is there a need for the source staff information officer to be available for with the public relations activities? Does the information officer influence the news of the legislature and/or legislators which is disseminated to the public? What effect does the information officers had upon the flow of news from legislators to the public through the press? Is the public information officer an effective channel for the legislator who desires to transmit information to constituents through the press? Are the information officers in the dissemination of information about legislators and the business of the legislature to the public via the media? Are there areas of over or under emphasis in the type of news originating from the source staff? Does officers share the source staff and the Public Information Officer where the greatest information effort? What balance is the chief burden of the information activities? Does one or more or type of legislator derive the greatest benefit from the source-originated public

relations activities? What justifies the expenditure of tax money in support of partisan public relations activities? What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of partisan public relations setup? What are the advantages and/or disadvantages of a non-partisan public relations setup? How important is the information officer's loyalty in the performance of his job for his caucus? Do the information officers make a contribution to the state's public information system, that system by which a citizen learns of the activities of his state government? What is that contribution? Has the establishment of the information officer positions affected the relationship of reporter and legislator? What function does the press fill in its coverage of the state legislature? What is the function of the reporter in covering the state legislature? How would you rate the press for its coverage of the state legislature? What problems does the reporter confront in his attempts to cover the state legislature? Is there a generally held image of the state legislature? If so, what is that image? Do the public relations activities of the information officers and the caucus staffs do anything to alter that image of the legislature? Can any comparison be made between the operations of the information officers and the Governor's Press Secretary? What proposals for constructive change in the information activities of the caucus staff can you make? How vital is personal publicity for a state legislator? Have any attacks been made against the information officers for their public relations activities?

publication activities, which jeopardizes the independence of the agency in support of practices public relations activities. Some are the advantages and/or disadvantages of practices public relations behind have are the advantages and/or disadvantages of a non-practices public relations agency. How important is the information officer's loyalty to the performance of the job for the center? In the information officers make a contribution to the center's public information system, which system by which a critical lacunae of the activities of the office permanently. Does it fall overwhelmingly. The lack information of the information officer practices activeness the relationship of regular the legislature. What functions does the power fall in the agencies of the state legislature. Which is the function of the objective is activating the state legislature. The media you make the power for its campaign of the state legislature. What problems does the organization faced in the campaign to serve the state legislature. In terms a quantity held image of the state legislature. If so, what is the image. In the public relations activities of the information officers and the course effects be anything to either that image of the legislature. Can any suggestions be made towards the operations of the information officers for the Governor's Press Secretary. Some proposals for constructive change in the information activities of the office state? How you assess the first in personal publicity for a state legislature. Have any studies been made weighing the information officers for state public relations activities.

910 Schumann Street
Sun Prairie, Wis. 53590
September 27, 1971

Dear Representative

I am a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin in the School of Journalism.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to support, in a small way, my Master's degree thesis on the information and public relations functioning of the Wisconsin Legislature's caucus staffs.

This questionnaire will attempt to arrive at some indication of what information dissemination techniques legislators use; who prepares or assists in the preparation of information type items or activities; and, the scope of distribution of those items.

This is strictly an anonymous questionnaire and no individual will be named in the body of the study or the footnotes.

For your convenience, a self addressed stamped envelope is attached to the questionnaire. Simply complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the attached envelope.

All members of the legislature are receiving this questionnaire. Your individual cooperation will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Michael S. Kelly

. As a legislator, how do you make use of these information dissemination techniques?

	DON'T USE	USE DAILY	USE WEEKLY	USE MONTHLY	OTHER (SPECIFY)
a. Press Releases	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Periodic Personal Newspaper Column	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Radio "Beepers" (Tapes)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Periodic Personal Radio Show	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. Constituent Newsletter	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f. TV Tapes	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. Periodic Personal TV Show	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h. Press Conferences	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

2. Who prepares or assists you in the preparation of the items or activities?

	SELF	ADMIN ASS'T.	SEC'Y	CAUCUS STAFF	OTHER (SPECIFY)
a. Press Releases	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Periodic Personal Newspaper Column	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Radio "Beepers" (Tapes)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Periodic Personal Radio Show	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. Constituent Newsletter	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f. TV Tapes	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. Periodic Personal TV Show	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h. Press Conferences	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

ADMIN. ASS'T. = Administrative Assistant
SEC'Y - Secretary

3. How many media outlets do you distribute these items to?

	SPECIFY NUMBER
a. Press Releases	( )
b. Periodic Personal Newspaper Column	( )
c. Radio "Beepers" (Tapes)	( )
d. Periodic Personal Radio Show	( )
e. TV Tapes	( )
f. Periodic Personal TV Show	( )

4. LEGISLATOR'S AGE _____

5. NUMBER OF TERMS IN OFFICE _____

6. SENATOR ( )

OR

ASSEMBLYMAN ( )

7. REPUBLICAN ( )

OR

DEMOCRAT ( )

Thesis 131726
K2856 Kelly
The public information and public relations functioning of the Wisconsin Legislature's caucus staffs.